

CORNELL UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARIES  
ITHACA, N. Y. 14853



JOHN M. OLIN  
LIBRARY

INSULAR LATIN STUDIES:

LATIN TEXTS AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BRITISH ISLES:

550-1066

Edited by Michael Herren

This collection is the fruit of a small multi-disciplinary symposium held at York University, Toronto, in 1979. The contributions include work by specialists in manuscript studies, philology, history of education, history of science, hagiography, and literary theory. Among the questions addressed are: texts and their histories in the British Isles, works known to the English and the Irish, composition of libraries, peculiarities of Latinity, the teaching of the liberal arts and of science, and canons of literary theory in Latin composition. Attention is also paid to the activities of the English and the Irish on the continent. The collection is intended to illustrate the unique place of the British Isles in the cultural history of early medieval Europe.

Contributors are Michael Herren, John Contreni, Michael Lapidge, Wesley Stevens, Gernot Wieland, Colin Chase, David Dumville, Christine Ineichen-Eder and François Kerlouégan.

# INSULAR LATIN STUDIES

Papers on Latin Texts and Manuscripts  
of the British Isles: 550-1066

EDITED BY

MICHAEL W. HERREN



PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

TORONTO 1981





OLIN  
A  
3  
59  
981

INSULAR LATIN STUDIES  
Papers on Latin Texts and Manuscripts  
of the British Isles 550-1066

### Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Main entry under title:  
Insular Latin studies

(Papers in mediaeval studies, ISSN 0228-8605 ; no. 1)  
Text in English and French.  
Papers given at a multi-disciplinary symposium at  
York University, Toronto, 1979.  
Includes indexes.  
ISBN 0-88844-801-5

1. Latin philology, Medieval and modern - Congresses.
2. Manuscripts, Latin (Medieval and modern) - Great Britain - Congresses. I. Herren, Michael W., 1940-
- II. Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- III. Series.

PA23.I57      870'.3'0941      C81-094899-0



©1981 by

PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

59 Queen's Park Crescent East

Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 2C4

Printed by Universa, Wetteren, Belgium



### CONTENTS

Contributors	v1
Acknowledgements	vii
Preface	Michael HERREN ix
Abbreviations	xiii
1 Hiberno-Latin Philology: The State of the Question	Michael HERREN 1
2 John Scottus, Martin Hiberniensis, the Liberal Arts, and Teaching	John J. CONTRENI 23
3 The Present State of Anglo-Latin Studies	Michael LAPIDGE 45
4 Scientific Instruction in Early Insular Schools	Wesley M. STEVENS 83
5 Geminus Stilus: Studies in Anglo-Latin Hagiography	Gernot WIELAND 113
6 Alcuin's Grammar Verse: Poetry and Truth in Carolingian Pedagogy	Colin CHASE 135
7 English Libraries Before 1066: Use and Abuse of the Manuscript Evidence	David DUMVILLE 153
8 The Authenticity of the <i>Dicta Candidi</i> , <i>Dicta Albini</i> , and some Related Texts	Christine E. INEICHEN-EDER 179
9 Les Vies De Saints Bretons Les Plus Anciennes Dans Leurs Rapport Avec Les Iles Britanniques	François KERLOUEGAN 195
Indices	215



## THE CONTRIBUTORS

MICHAEL HERREN works on the Latin literature of the British Isles and teaches classical and medieval Latin at York University.

JOHN J. CONTRENI specializes in early medieval intellectual history and teaches medieval history at Purdue University in Indiana.

MICHAEL LAPIDGE is a specialist in the Latin literature of the British Isles and teaches Anglo-Latin Studies at the University of Cambridge.

WESLEY STEVENS is a specialist in the history of medieval science and teaches medieval history at the University of Winnipeg.

GERNOT WIELAND specializes in the field of Anglo-Latin manuscript studies and teaches in the English Department at the University of British Columbia.

COLIN CHASE teaches Latin and Old English in the Medieval Centre, University of Toronto.

DAVID DUMVILLE works in the early medieval history of the British Isles and teaches manuscript studies at the University of Cambridge.

CHRISTINE INEICHEN-EDER has taught paleography and medieval Latin in universities in Germany and at the University of Notre Dame.

FRANÇOIS KERLOUEGAN is a specialist in the Latin literature of the British Isles and Brittany and teaches comparative philology at the University of Besançon.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The conference, "Latin Texts and Manuscripts of the British Isles: 550-1066," held at Glendon College, York University, Toronto, April 18-21, 1979, was generously assisted by grants from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, by the Office of the President, York University, and by the Dean of Atkinson College, York University. The organizer also wishes to acknowledge the participation of the Consulate General of France in Toronto. Special personal acknowledgements are accorded to Professor Alain Baudot, Glendon College, and to Professor S. A. Brown, Atkinson College, for their generous help both before and during the conference.

The present book, which consists of the revised proceedings of the conference, was typed at the expense of Atkinson College. The editor wishes to express his gratitude to the Office of the Dean, Mrs. Margo Hooker, Mrs. Mozelle Friedrichs, Miss Lynn Horwood and Miss Marion Rigon for their kindness and generosity in this effort. Finally, an expression of gratitude to Miss Dyan Elliott and to Prof. S. A. Brown for their patient assistance in preparing the manuscript and reading proofs.



## PREFACE

This volume is a collection of the papers given at the conference "Latin Texts and Manuscripts of the British Isles: 550-1066," held at Glendon College, York University, April 18-21, 1979. The purpose of that conference was to bring together scholars from various disciplines - paleography, philology, history - who have concentrated their studies on Latin texts and their diffusion both in England and in Ireland (with some forays on to the continent) during the period before the Norman Conquest. It is always to be hoped that a conference will be something more than the aggregate of the individual contributions, especially if a book is to result. It is gratifying to observe that a number of motifs play throughout the various papers - motifs that do indeed characterize and define what may be termed "Insular Latin Culture."

First and foremost we note the deep respect for the Latin word that pervades the literature of both islands. Grammar was cultivated assiduously in England and in Ireland - indeed, it can be fairly stated that virtually every grammatical work salvaged from classical antiquity was known, read, and excerpted by insular scholars prior to the Carolingian Renaissance. In the period when standards of Latin literacy were in decline on the continent, we find an admirable concern for them among insular writers. This concern extended far beyond the requirements of grammatical correctness to an interest in and cultivation of the niceties of Latin style, both in prose and in poetry. But if grammar was the most fundamental of the artes, it was not the only one. Respect was paid to them all; the identification of the seven liberal arts with the seven pillars of Wisdom is a theme that runs through insular Latin literature from Aldhelm to Alcuin to John. Science, under the name of *computus* was studied on both islands, and what began as a practical problem for churchmen - the computation of the date of Easter - gave impetus to a more theoretical study of natural phenomena. Theology, which had experienced virtual extinction in the West after the death of Boethius, became once again a living subject in the hands of the "Irish Augustine," of Alcuin, and of course, John Scotus. Alcuin,



followed by John, affirmed the role of human reason (informed by the *artes*) in the process of the attainment of eternal salvation, culminating in John's dictum: "Nemo intrat in caelum nisi per philosophiam."

If any one figure dominated our proceedings, it was Alcuin. Not because he was the most brilliant personage on the insular stage - John held that honour - but because he was the most typical. His breadth of learning, his clear Latin style, his faith in the efficacy of education and his practical attainments as a pedagogue exemplify what was best in the Carolingian revival. Yet Alcuin intrigues us here, because, unlike so many of the insular masters who went to the continent, we know a good deal about the native component of his formation, thus allowing us to assess in part what was specifically insular in his contribution.

Inevitably, a symposium of this type will product surprises, or at least new emphases. A good deal has been written about the cultural relations between the English and the Irish in our period as well as about the impact of the two groups on continental learning. What has so often been ignored in our discussions is the important role played by that Celtic group that had settled along the Atlantic coast of France before the beginning of our period: the Bretons. It is becoming increasingly clear now that this group was a vital link in the two-way communications system between the British Isles and the continent - first as importers and preservers of the early hagiographical materials of Ireland and Wales, otherwise largely lost; secondly, as exporters of manuscripts to Anglo-Saxon England in the latter part of our period. Fleury seems to have been the hub of this activity, and the figure of the polymath Abbo invites deeper investigation, as do the Latin writings of Brittany in general.

The beginnings of our period, from ca. 550 to ca. 800, have been well studied. It emerged from our proceedings that a great deal of work remains to be done for the second half, both as to the cataloguing of manuscripts and to the edition of texts and the study of their Latinity. This is certainly true for Anglo-Saxon England, with the ninth being the darkest century. Whether the gloom results from a lack of study or is indeed the true darkness of barbarism remains to be investigated. The same can be said of Ireland. Few attempts have been made to examine the remnants of Latin culture on that island after the Viking incursions.

The essays presented here are revised versions of the conference papers. Each author has endeavoured to annotate his paper as fully as possible. It is hoped that the detailed annotation will enable this volume to serve as a kind of "Handbook of Insular Studies" (a title suggested by one of the participants), and thus have a continuing usefulness for present and future students in this field. Every effort has been made to up-date the bibliography between 1979 and the date of publication. As editor, I have attempted to achieve a rather general consistency in format and to ensure accuracy of citation. Beyond that, each author must speak for himself. The papers are presented in the order in which they were given at the conference.

I conclude with the hope that the work of this conference can be continued - dare I suggest that the venue be one of the British Isles or Brittany? Whatever site is chosen, let the *arcatores* go thither "by the fleetload" to dispute in elegant fashion the mysteries of handwriting. A symposium devoted to all aspects of the insular book would complement in a wonderful way the work begun here.



# ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Analecta Bollandiana
ALMA	Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi (Bulletin Du Cange)
ASE	Anglo-Saxon England
BBCS	Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies
C&M	Classica et Mediaevalia
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum, Scriptores Latini
CLA	Codices Latini Antiquiores, ed. Lowe
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (the Vienna Corpus)
EC	Etudes Celtiques
E.C.M.	Bishop, English Caroline Miniscule
EETS	Early English Text Society
EHR	English Historical Review
H.E.	Bede, Historia Ecclesiastica
H.F.	Hisperica Famina
MAe	Medium Aevum
MGH	Monumenta Historica Germaniae
Auct. Ant.	Auctores Antiquissimi
Poet. Lat.	Poetae Latini Carolini Aevi
S.R.M.	Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum
MJ	Mittellatienisches Jahrbuch
M.L.G.B.	Ker, Medieval Libraries of Great Britain
MS	Mediaeval Studies
PBA	Proceedings of the British Academy
PL	Patrologia Latina, ed. Migne
PRIA	Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy
RB	Revue Bénédictine
SC	Studia Celtica
SE	Sacris Erudiri
SH	Studia Hibernica

SM *Studi Mediaevali*  
 TCBS *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*  
 UTQ *University of Toronto Quarterly*

# HIBERNO-LATIN PHILOLOGY: THE STATE OF THE QUESTION

Michael Herren

York University

To many scholars of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, Hiberno-Latin literature is a subject that lies, so to speak, beyond the Pale. Not only is the subject thought to be obscure, it is also considered to be restricted, as though it might be likened to the examination of the remains of Venetic or Illyrian. It is true that our subject is still relatively young; its compass, however, as most of us here know, is extremely broad. Indeed, so much has been done since the pioneering work of the late nineteenth century<sup>1</sup> that any attempt to summarize the field constitutes a formidable challenge. It is therefore essential to be highly selective. This selectivity must of necessity be controlled by the constraints of my own interests and knowledge as well as by those of time.

First of all, it seemed prudent to limit my summary to the scholarship of the last twenty-five years, although I have made a few exceptions. Secondly, I have generally restricted my discussion to what might be termed "the formative period," i.e., 550-800, although I make a few sallies beyond. Of necessity I deal with the output of Ireland itself, when that can be established, and with the products of Irish centres in Britain and on the continent. I have thought it useful to approach my task by subjects or issues rather than chronologically or geographically. This makes it easier to establish what has been resolved and to show where further work needs to be done. I have thought the following headings appropriate: (1) linguistic problems, (2) literary features, (3) literary historical questions, and (4) desiderata.

Before taking up these individual problems, it would be useful to note that the principal achievement of the past twenty-five years has

*Insular Latin Studies*, ed. Michael Herren,  
 Papers in Mediaeval Studies 1 (Toronto:  
 Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981)  
 pp. 1-22



been the establishment of good critical editions of many of the monuments of Hiberno-Latin literature. The scholar who did the most to bring this about, in the dual role of editor and promoter, was Ludwig Bieler. If any one achievement can be regarded as the cornerstone of modern Hiberno-Latin studies, it was the establishment of the *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* series published by the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies. There we find good critical editions with reliable translations as well as meticulous indices of grammar, orthography, and lexica compiled by Bieler himself. To date we have (in order of publication): A. Gwynn's *The Writings of Bishop Patrick* (1955), G. S. M. Walker's *Sancti Columbanus Opera* (1957), D. Meehan's *Adamnan's De Locis Sanctis* (1958), M. Esposito's *Itinerarium Symonis Semeonis Ab Hybernia ad Terram Sanctam* (1960), Bieler's *The Irish Penitentials* (1963), J. J. Tierney's *Dicuili Liber de Mensura Orbis Terrae* (1967), I. P. Sheldon-Williams' *Iohannis Scotti Eriugena Periphyseon* (part I, 1968; part II, 1972), and Bieler's *Four Latin Lives of Saint Patrick* (1970). (Other works intended for this series will be noted below.) It is to be regretted that the Dublin Institute lacked the funding necessary to achieve greater completeness in publications. A number of editions that would have been very appropriate to this series had to find a niche elsewhere. Two series in particular have offered accommodation to Hiberno-Latin projects: Studies and Texts of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies Press, Toronto, which has published my *Hisperica Famina I: The A-Text* (1974) and D. Brearley's *Commentum Sedulii Scotti in Maiorem Donatum Grammaticum* (1975). The second is the *Corpus Christianorum* of Turnhout, Belgium, which has recently published a good number of Hiberno-Latin grammatical and exegetical works. The grammatical works appeared in the *Continuatio Mediaevalis* division of that series, vols. 40-40C. They are: Louis Holtz's *Murethach: In Donati Artem Maiorem* (40, 1977); Bengt Löfstedt's *Ars Lauresheimensis* (40A, 1977); *Sedulii Scotti in Donati Artem Maiorem* (40B, 1977); *Sedulii Scotti in Donati Artem Minorem, in Priscianum, in Eutychem* (40C, 1977). One volume of exegesis appeared in the same series: J. Barbet's *Iohannis Scotti Eriugena Expositiones in Ierarchiam Coelestem* (30, 1975). Other volumes of exegesis appeared in the *Series Latina* section: G. Morin's *S. Hieronymi in Esaia Parvula Adbreviatio* (73A, 1963), M. Adriaen's edition of Lathcen's *Eclogae Moraliu Gregorii in Iob* (145, 1969), R. E. McNally's *Scriptores Hiberniae Minores Pars I* (108B, 1973), and Joseph Kelly's *Scriptores Hiberniae Minores Pars II*

(180C, 1974). (I have just learned of the appearance of G. Madec's *Iohannis Scotti de Divina Praedestinatione Liber* in the *Continuatio Mediaevalis* [50, 1978].)

A number of important editions appeared outside the aegis of the above-named series. Among these are A. O. and M. O. Anderson's edition of *Adomnan's Life of Columba* (London, 1962), Bengt Löfstedt's *Der hibernolateinische Grammatiker Malsachanus* (Uppsala, 1965), M. C. Diaz y Diaz's edition of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Liber de Ordine Creaturarum* (Santiago de Compostela, 1972), Edouard Jeuneau's editions of Eriugena's exegetical works in *Sources Chrétiennes* no. 151 (1969) and no. 180 (1972), G. Orlandi's new work on the *Navigatio Sancti Brendani* (Miano-Varese, 1976), and the text and study of *The Bishop's Synod: The First Synod of St. Patrick* by M. J. Faris et al. (Liverpool, 1976).

Let us turn now to linguistic matters. It has been remarked that, strictly speaking, there is no such thing as Hiberno-Latin.<sup>2</sup> This is an over-statement. It is true that Hiberno-Latin is essentially medieval Latin; yet, it is influenced by a handful of features of the Old Irish language and possesses other eccentricities, which, if not exclusive to Hiberno-Latin, occur there far more regularly than elsewhere. It was once fashionable, however to attribute almost any peculiarity of Latin syntax, phonetics, or word formation to Irish influence. Many of these eccentricities were later shown to be common to Vulgar and Late Latin in general. It is surprising, for example, that so careful a scholar as Père P. Grosjean regarded the nominative absolute as a peculiarly Hibernian construction. In fact, examples of this phenomenon are abundant before the first outbreak of Hiberno-Latin literature.<sup>3</sup> The earliest systematic attempt to catalogue the characteristics of Hiberno-Latin, with special reference to the influences of the Irish language, was the doctoral dissertation of Father W. Most entitled *The Syntax of the Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae*.<sup>4</sup> Most divided his work into chapters on gender and number, case usage, the adjective and adverb, the pronoun, prefixes and prepositions, nominal forms of the verb, and syntax of clauses. The work concludes with a summary (Ch. 9) of the influence of Old Irish syntax on the Latinity of the Vitae. The data collected in the work are still useful, but the interpretations of syntactical peculiarities - especially those related to the Irish language - must be used with great caution. Like other writers before him, Father Most tried to use Old Irish to explain certain phenomena that were best explained by Latin itself.



In his excellent introduction to the *Irish Penitentials*, Professor Bieler warned us of some of the difficulties of trying to isolate "characteristic" Hibernian spellings.<sup>5</sup> As these texts are based on Frankish exemplars, Bieler was right to remark on the difficulty, if not impossibility, of identifying Hibernian, as distinct from Merovingian and common Vulgar Latin spellings. Very few individual spellings can be adduced as an argument that a given text is either Hiberno-Latin or is transmitted through Irish hands. What is crucial to Bieler is the "frequency, if not regularity" of such spellings. Moreover, a few types of spellings are interesting because their irregularities owe nothing to the common Vulgar Latin sound changes. Bengt Löfstedt thinks that certain types of spelling "mistakes," such as *anthleta* and *distinguens*, are hyperurbanisms.<sup>6</sup> Dag Norberg argues that the terms "hyperurbanism" and "vulgarism" are not applicable to the writings of a people to whom Latin was such an entirely foreign language.<sup>7</sup> But he seems to carry this argument too far. Granted that the Latin phonetic system must have been quite strange to Irish ears, there is a great deal to suggest that the Irish scholars and students of Latin were very aware of mistakes, not only in written Latin but in the spoken language as well. This awareness is evidenced in the flytings of the *Hisperica Famina* and in the debates over spelling and pronunciation found in the pages of Virgilius Maro.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, good arguments have been adduced to show that the *Appendix Probi*, that famous list of spelling (and pronunciation?) mistakes along with their "corrections," assigned to varying dates in antiquity, was compiled at Bobbio ca. 700, possibly by an Irish redactor.<sup>9</sup>

It is true that the Irish introduced a small number of orthographical peculiarities into their manuscripts that can be explained only by reference to the influence of Irish orthography (and, perhaps, pronunciation) on Latin orthography. These have been catalogued exhaustively by Bengt Löfstedt in the introduction to his edition of *Malsachanus*.<sup>10</sup> Löfstedt is to be commended for not exaggerating the Irish influence on orthography (or on morphology and syntax, for that matter). I discussed certain orthographical questions in detail in a paper delivered at a colloquium in Tübingen dealing with the Irish and the continent in the early Middle Ages.<sup>11</sup>

If there are some peculiarities in Irish spelling and morphology, we must nonetheless not imagine that the Irish imposed their eccentricities on some sort of pure classical Latin which they had

inherited free of any taint of vulgar (i.e., continental) influence. And there is little, if anything, in the Hiberno-Latin works we possess to show that the Irish got their Latin from Britain, and not from the continent.<sup>12</sup> The evidence for "British-Latin" influences in Ireland must be found in the Irish language, not the Latin language preserved in Ireland.<sup>13</sup> Our best evidence for early eighth-century Irish Latin is to be found in the famous Schaffhausen manuscript of Adomnan's *Vita Columbae*, copied by the Irishman Dorbhene. This monument is important because it is one of the very few instances of an approximately dated text of certain Hiberno-Latin origin preserved in an approximately dated manuscript and known to be copied by an Irishman not long after the composition of the text.<sup>14</sup> This document leaves no doubt that some features of Vulgar Latin had permeated Irish Latin as well. These corroborate the phenomena I label as "vulgar" in the *Hisperica Famina*, of which at least the A-Text is preserved in a continental manuscript copied from an Irish exemplar.<sup>15</sup>

The lexical area is one of the most interesting for students of Hiberno-Latin. From the earliest period of Irish Latin writings we note the habit of introducing native Irish words with Latin endings. Hincmar of Reims accused his nephew of introducing *Scottica et alia barbara (verba)* into his Latin, which leads us to surmise that this was a widespread Irish habit.<sup>16</sup> The practice may have begun in the seventh century with Virgil the Grammarian - about whom we shall say more below - and spread fairly rapidly. Certainly we find examples in Hisperic texts, but the practice is by no means confined to those works. Examples can be found in virtually every genre of Hiberno-Latin literature: grammars, law texts, peregrination literature, and hagiographical materials.<sup>17</sup> I think that the presence of such forms in a text is one of the best indices that the text is of Hiberno-Latin origin.

A handful of neologisms and so-called "sense neologisms" seem to have been coined in Ireland, probably towards the end of the sixth century, and these became fixtures in the vocabulary labelled as "insular." By the middle of the seventh century, these words had made their way to England where they were adopted - at least initially - by Anglo-Latin writers. Many, if not all such words, are properly Hisperic or occur in Virgil the Grammarian, who seems to have been connected to Hisperic compositions. I trace the history of one such word *caraxare* (often spelled *craxare*) in the article mentioned below. A. K. Brown, in his excellent article, "Bede, a Hisperic Etymology and



Sea Poetry,"<sup>18</sup> has traced the history of insular *dodrans* from sixth-century Ireland to Bede. He demonstrates convincingly that the misunderstanding of the word as "flood" rather than as "three-fourths" (its classical meaning) must have begun in Ireland in the sixth century, as it is used in that sense by Columbanus ca. 600. This usage then spread to England, where it is employed in the same sense by Alcuin and his school. The misinterpretation is corrected by Bede, but not before it has influenced the meaning of the native Old English word *egor*. The recent study by François Kerlouégan, "Une liste de mots communs à Gildas et à Aldhelm,"<sup>19</sup> confirms the hypothesis that certain trends in word formation and word usage originated in Wales; migrated to Ireland in the sixth century; then spread to Anglo-Saxon England, probably through the Irish missionaries in the seventh century.

Before leaving the area of vocabulary, a word on the purposes of the employment of "Hisperic" and other arcane vocabulary in Hiberno-Latin literature would be in order. Michael Lapidge has rightly warned that "Hisperic" ought to be used strictly to refer to the "exceedingly obscure and almost secretive language of the *Hisperica Famina* themselves, compositions which abound in grecisms and are characterized by a predictable kind of neologism."<sup>20</sup> But Hisperic and other rare words, whether neologisms, grecisms or hebraisms, are sprinkled throughout Irish Latin compositions from the sixth to the ninth century. We find them in the hymns - and not just in the *Altus Prosator* - in the letters of Columbanus, in the *De Locis Sanctis* of Adomnan, in the Pseudo-Isidorian *De Ordine Creaturorum*, and the Pseudo-Augustinian *De Mirabilibus Sacrae (or Sanctae) Scripturae*. Even more peculiar is the vocabulary of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, who was almost certainly an Irishman of the seventh century, and that of "Aethicus Ister," almost certainly an Irishman of the eighth.<sup>21</sup>

As I argued a few years ago,<sup>22</sup> I think it time that we abandon the "Culture Fungus of Decay" theory advanced by Éoin MacNeill and followed by others. Literary decadence can only set in where there has been a lengthy tradition preserved by schools. I do not think that categories applied to the literary centres of Gaul, North Africa, Spain, and Italy itself in the period ca. 400-600 can be applied accurately to the situation in Ireland, where Latin learning did not come into being much before the middle of the sixth century. But the question arises: why would the Irish, who had barely begun to learn Latin, or at least to use it for literary purposes, have gone to such

lengths, at least in some instances, to make their Latin as obscure as possible? I think the answer is to be found in their own native literary tradition. As D. A. Binchy, with reference to Irish texts, put it so well: "For the fact is that the framers of these ancient verses [sc. of the legal texts] did everything to scare away the outsider. It was a vested interest, the interpretation of these sacred texts, and it was therefore desirable to make them as difficult as possible. There was another reason, too, for the obscurity. To the primitive mind, obscurity is very often synonymous with profundity."<sup>23</sup> There is a great deal to suggest that, from the middle of the sixth century, the Irish adapted their Latinity to the native tradition.<sup>24</sup>

If it is true that in the area of vocabulary and word formation the Irish were original, even outlandish, in the areas of word arrangement and other stylistic effects, their originality is not so marked. Christine Mohrmann in "The Earliest Continental Irish Latin"<sup>25</sup> argues that many tendencies found in Irish writers of Columbanus, which constitute our best evidence for early Irish "autochthonic" Latin, "must have been looked upon as a sort of anachronism"<sup>26</sup> by a literate Frank of ca. 600. Mohrmann views the style of Columbanus' letters as very florid, while regarding their syntax and general structure as a reflection of the "literary language of the fourth and fifth centuries."<sup>27</sup>

The question of style of Hiberno-Latin writers, apart from problems of vocabulary and idiom, remains to be more fully explored. The pioneering work in this field has been undertaken only in the last decade. François Kerlouégan, in his "Une mode stylistique dans la prose latine des pays celtiques,"<sup>28</sup> argued that the employment of interlacing word order of the type Adj.1/Adj.2/Subst.1/Subst.2, while relatively common in poetry, was quite rare in prose until its florescence in the sixth century in Wales, Ireland, Brittany, and Wessex - in short, Celtic domains or territories under Celtic educational influence. He garners his statistics from Gildas, Columbanus, Aldhelm, Adomnan, saints' lives from Brittany, and, of course, from the *Hisperica Famina*, which occupies an important position in this development. Michael Winterbottom argued against Kerlouégan's position in two articles. In "A 'Celtic' Hyperbaton?"<sup>29</sup> Winterbottom makes the case for a much wider diffusion of the phenomenon in late Latin prose than granted by Kerlouégan; moreover, according to Winterbottom, not all of Kerlouégan's examples are valid. In "Aldhelm's Prose Style and Its



Origins,"<sup>30</sup> Winterbottom makes some additional points. Apart from hyperbaton, which is well developed elsewhere, the writings of Aldhelm owe nothing to Celtic models for style (Winterbottom is not concerned with vocabulary); there is much to show that the shape of the Aldhelmian sentence is derived from continental models. On the other hand, Winterbottom acknowledges that the employment of hyperbaton around a central verb, in imitation of the "golden line" of classical poetry, was "at home" in Ireland.<sup>31</sup>

In his "Columbanus and Gildas,"<sup>32</sup> Winterbottom shows the debt of Columbanus to Gildas (whom Columbanus knew and cited) in the areas of metaphor, word order, alliteration, and sentence construction. Here Winterbottom seems readier to concede - albeit cautiously - that there was some stylistic continuity in matters of word order and alliteration from Gildas to Columbanus to Aldhelm. (Curiously, Winterbottom does not raise the question of whether Aldhelm could have known the letters of Columbanus.) With the exception of a few passages in Columbanus and the preface of Muirchu's life of Patrick, Winterbottom sees little influence of the "rambling periods of Gildas" on Irish writers of the seventh century;<sup>33</sup> elsewhere, Winterbottom refers to Ireland as "home of an unforced rhetoric and of grammatical correctness."<sup>34</sup>

It is certainly time that some more detailed studies of the style of individual Hiberno-Latin writers be made. We need far more studies along the lines of Winterbottom's work on Aldhelm: studies containing discussion of sentence construction, word order, prose rhythm, alliteration, assonance, rhyme, and other rhetorical devices of both sound and sense. We still lack such a study even for Columbanus. Winterbottom's article is far too brief, Mohrmann's work too general, while J. W. Smit's *Studies on the Language and Style of Columba the Younger (Columbanus)*<sup>35</sup> concerns itself with the interpretation of individual words and the solving of textual cruces rather than with style in the broader sense.

At this point I think it would be useful to discuss those features of Hiberno-Latin that might be termed "literary" rather than linguistic or stylistic. I refer to those features in the biblical commentaries noted by R. E. McNally and Bernhard Bischoff. Bischoff, in his famous article "Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter,"<sup>36</sup> lists as *irische Symptomen*: the use of *Ecloga* for "collection" or "selections"; the favouring of *Pauca de* in a title (e.g., the so-called *Ars Clementis* had the title *Pauca de*

*grammatica*); fondness for the "triad"<sup>37</sup> *locus, tempus, persona*; phrases such as *hic est ordo*; and perhaps the most characteristic of all, the answering of a question with the phrase *quin dubium*, or more especially *non difficile*, reflecting the Irish *ní anse*, a phrase frequently in the law tracts.

Another Irish feature noted by Bischoff and further developed by Father Robert E. McNally is the allusion to the three sacred languages: Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. McNally, in his article "The 'Tres Linguae Sacrae' in Early Bible Exegesis,"<sup>38</sup> makes a collection of these curiosities and explains their use. He asserts: "Where this question of the three languages is raised in a Bible commentary of unknown origin, one can certainly conclude to the influence of the Irish tradition."<sup>39</sup> As Bischoff, McNally, and others have noted: the use of real or bogus Hebrew and Greek, in addition to Latin, is not confined to exegetical works. We find examples in several grammatical treatises, including Virgilius Maro.<sup>40</sup> The tendency apparently became so widespread that it became a topic for parody by a certain "Sergilius," who called himself "discipulus Virgili."<sup>41</sup> Elsewhere we find examples in the letters of Columbanus,<sup>42</sup> in the *Vita Columbae* of Adomnan,<sup>43</sup> and in the Pseudo-Isidorian *Liber de Numeris*, which McNally attributes to the circle of Virgil of Salzburg.<sup>44</sup> Bischoff notes Bede's negative reaction to this curious custom in his *Hexameron*<sup>45</sup> - a reaction that might be instructively compared to that writer's criticism of the Irish use of *dodrans*.

Whether we can be certain that any one of these features in itself is sure evidence of Irish authorship or whether we must rely on a combination of such features remains a point of contention. Martin McNamara's article, "A Plea for Hiberno-Latin Biblical Studies,"<sup>46</sup> argues for the second method: "What leads one from a mere surmise on the possibility of Irish authorship to probability or even certainty is the combination in a single work of several of these symptoms. Then there are indications besides, as for example the presence of Irish peculiarities in the text, peculiarities in the abbreviation of words, of spelling, etc. Putting all these together we can form strong arguments for Irish authorship."<sup>47</sup> Perhaps the most deeply sceptical of the Bischoff-McNally method of establishing the Irish origin of a text was Edmondo Coccia. In his "La cultura irlandese precarolingia: Miracolo o mito?"<sup>48</sup> he wrote of McNally's arguments for the Irish origin of a commentary on the Catholic Epistles: "Ma tale metodo viene



detto irlandese perché riscontrabile in altri commentari biblici che, a loro volta, sono messi in relazione con l'Irlanda solo per dubbie ricostruzioni ipotetiche."<sup>49</sup>

Although I do not accept the radical scepticism of Coccia, I am at times a little uneasy about the assumption that the presence in a text of two or three of the features listed by Bischoff constitutes proof of Irish origin. The vast majority of the manuscripts containing every sort of Hiberno-Latin literature are continental. We know that there were non-Irish in Irish monastic centres as well as Irish in non-Irish centres. Even granting that most so-called "Irish symptoms" originated in Ireland or in some Irish milieu, there was nothing to prevent the spread of literary fads outside Irish circles, even allowing for the censure and parody of such fads by Bede and by non-Irishmen on the continent in the time of Charlemagne. Without the presence of philological evidence, such as that discussed above, we would be wiser to refer to such works as "exhibiting Irish influence" rather than "Irish."

In connection with the *tres linguae sacrae*, a word or two on the question of the Irish knowledge of Greek and Hebrew would be appropriate. Professor Bischoff in "Wendepunkte" and more especially in his "Das griechische Element in der abendländischen Bildung des Mittelalters"<sup>50</sup> has shown that most of the Greek known to the Irish was derived from glossaries, and, in not a small number of cases was purely fictitious. Bischoff rightly distinguishes between a knowledge of a language acquired from glossaries alone and that derived from a proper grammatical study. That the Irish studied the Greek classics in Ireland during the period 550-800 is no longer seriously entertained. Still a few niggles remain regarding a wholly negative picture. The textual evidence for a brighter view is highly tentative, but there are a few bits that show that the Irish possessed at least a superficial knowledge of the Greek language in the seventh and eighth centuries.<sup>51</sup> There is some evidence that the Irish knew and used the Greek bible before the Carolingian period.<sup>52</sup> By the ninth century, the evidence for the Irish knowledge of Greek is abundant. John Contreni has added greatly to our knowledge of Hiberno-Greek learning in his work *The Cathedral School of Laon from 880-930: its Manuscripts and Masters*.<sup>53</sup> It is difficult to imagine, in the light of such demonstrated learning, that the Irish in Ireland had no access to Greek grammars in the formative period. As to the situation of Hebrew, my own research on Virgilius Maro Grammaticus confirms the now generally

accepted notion that the Irish knowledge of Hebrew was restricted virtually to lists of words derived from Jerome and Isidore, plus what the fecund imaginations of the Irish scholars could contrive. For the knowledge of Hebrew in the early Middle Ages, including Ireland, we now have the excellent study by Matthias Thiel: *Grundlagen und Gestalt der Hebräischkenntnisse des frühen Mittelalters*.<sup>54</sup>

In the past twenty years or so, some radical shifts have taken place in matters such as the dating and authenticity of a considerable amount of Hiberno-Latin literature. This in turn had led to a re-evaluation of the nature and quality of that literature and the culture that produced it. What I term the older view - a view that still has many adherents - lays stress on the "classical quality" of that literature: purity of style coupled with a knowledge of at least the major Latin works of classical antiquity. By this account, Ireland is reckoned as the *insula sanctorum doctorumque* at a time when the rest of Europe languished in barbarism.<sup>55</sup> Moreover, such features of style as long, contorted sentences and Hisperic vocabulary were viewed as aberrations: the flotsam and jetsam of the "decadent" literature derived from southwestern British culture of the sixth century. Generally speaking, the past twenty years have produced a near reversal of that evaluation. Ireland's knowledge of the Latin classics as well as her ability to produce good metrical poetry during the formative period has been brought into serious question. On the other hand, there is now much evidence to show that Ireland played a much greater role than previously thought in the development of arcane vocabulary and stylistic monstrosities such as the *scinderatio fonorum*.

The cornerstone of the older orthodoxy was the argument that Columbanus or Columba the Younger, who was alleged to have been born before the middle of the sixth century and educated at Bangor, wrote a number of metrical poems in which he quotes or paraphrases Vergil, Horace, Ovid, and a number of the later Christian poets; further, that his letters also reflect classical erudition. Challenges to the argument were made by Gustav Hertel<sup>56</sup> in the nineteenth century, and more recently by Mario Esposito.<sup>57</sup> Hertel denied the authenticity of the poems, while Esposito argued that Columbanus' classical learning was acquired on the continent. In 1971, J. W. Smit published his dissertation, *Studies on the Language and Style of Columba the Younger (Columbanus)*.<sup>58</sup> Smit attacked the question on two fronts: first, he attempted to show that the classical reminiscences in Columbanus'



letters could either be traced to late sources, such as Jerome, or were in fact *loci communes*. Secondly, he expanded Hertel's arguments against the authenticity of the poems. In the first assault he was highly successful; in the second, much less so.

Just recently, a much more effective onslaught against the authenticity of the metrical poems was launched by Michael Lapidge in his "The Authorship of the Adonic Verses 'Ad Fidolium' Attributed to Columbanus."<sup>59</sup> This paper makes an entirely new case against Columbanus of Bobbio's authorship of "Ad Fidolium," "Ad Sethum," and "Ad Hunaldum" and argues that they were written between the late eighth and early ninth centuries by a Columbanus who was the abbot of St. Trond and the author of the *Planctus* on the death of Charlemagne. Lapidge discards the arguments of Hertel and Smit and offers totally fresh ones based upon the form of the "Ad Fidolium," the manuscript tradition, the sources (especially the classical ones), and the possible identities of the recipients of the three poems. His most striking discovery centres on the name Fidolius, which occurs in a confraternity list from St. Peter's in Salzburg in the *familia* of the Irish bishop Virgil (767-784). According to Lapidge, the name is "extremely rare and may well be unique."<sup>60</sup> The evidence is enhanced by the fact that the earliest manuscript of the "Ad Fidolium" was copied in the late eighth century, probably before ca. 790.<sup>61</sup> Whether the learned world will accept the case as closed is not certain. But those who would re-instate Columbanus of Bobbio as the author of the metrical poems just named will now have to deal with the new arguments and new evidence raised by Lapidge.

Another blow by E. Coccia,<sup>62</sup> followed again by Lapidge, was aimed at the reputation of the Irish as composers of metrical poetry in the seventh century. At stake is the allegation that Cellanus, abbot of Perrona Scottorum and a correspondent of Aldhelm's towards the end of the seventh century, penned a handful of hexameters on the dedication of an oratory to St. Patrick. Coccia was certainly right to call our attention to the prefacing lines: "Haec modo Cellanus venerandi nominis abbas/iussit dactilico describi carmina versu." He queries whether the words *iussit describi* can be taken as sure proof of authorship. Lapidge, in his "Some Remnants of Bede's lost Liber Epigrammatum,"<sup>63</sup> challenges Traube's assumption that the author of the lines was identical with Aldhelm's correspondent. Lapidge notes, however, that internal evidence shows the author to have been Irish and that the earliest

manuscript of the lines dates from the eighth century.

Coccia is more successful in loosening the support for the notion that the Irish composed metrical verses in the seventh century in querying Manitius' suggestion that the "Versus Cuiusdam Scoti de Alphabeto" (a series of rather witty alphabet letter name riddles) were composed in that century.<sup>64</sup> Manitius offers no stronger evidence than some slight acquaintance with Greek and Hebrew alphabet lore expressed in the poem (typical of seventh-century Irish activity, but by no means confined to it) and the mention of the name of Pope Gregory the Great; Manitius also alleges that the Anglo-Saxon Eusebius relied on the poem for his own alphabetical riddles - an allegation that might warrant further investigation. In short, there is no convincing reason for assigning the poem to the seventh century rather than to the eighth or even the early ninth.

My arguments regarding the date and locale of the *Hesperica Famina*,<sup>65</sup> and more recently, those advocating that Virgil the Grammarian was a seventh-century Irishman, not a fifth or sixth-century Gaul,<sup>66</sup> give us a different picture of the formative period, at least for the seventh century. If Virgil was in any way typical of mid-seventh-century Hiberno-Latin culture - and I fear that he may have been - then we must conclude, for lack of evidence to the contrary, that the preservation of classical culture was not an Irish occupation at that time. Virgil's own classical education was impoverished. In his section on metre in the *Epitomae*, Virgil uses metrical terminology, but the examples he employs reveal that Virgil knew nothing of metrical practice. His sources do not appear to go beyond the bible, Jerome, Isidore, and an assortment of grammarians. He displays, however, a fondness for pseudo-learning that exceeds that of *Hesperica Famina*: abstruse vocabulary, use of Greek, Hebrew, Irish, and possibly even Germanic words as well as hybrids, highly fanciful etymologies, puns and word-plays, alphabet lore, and various kinds of cryptograms. If Virgil's writings were not intended as a "send-up" - and I am not completely convinced that they were - then they must represent an attempt to graft the skin of Irish *filidecht* such as we find in the *Auraicept na n'Eces* onto the flesh of Latin culture. After 700 or thereabouts, our evidence for this Hiberno-Latin culture in Ireland proper attenuates, as the vernacular begins to assume more of the roles once reserved for Latin.<sup>67</sup> It is in the vernacular literature, however, that we find the best evidence for the early Irish classical



tradition, although most of the material crops up after the high point of Irish activity on the continent, i.e., the late ninth century. W. B. Stanford has studied this interesting area in two works: *Ireland and the Classical Tradition*,<sup>68</sup> and in greater detail for the early medieval period in "Towards a History of Classical Influences in Ireland."<sup>69</sup>

Hiberno-Latin literature in the eighth century seems to have been heavily concentrated on the production of grammars<sup>70</sup> and on exegetical and hagiographical materials.<sup>71</sup> An important exception is, possibly, the fascinating composition known as the *Cosmographia*, written by a self-styled Hieronymus Presbiter, who professed to present a Latin epitome of the writings of a Greek scientist and traveller named Aethicus Ister ("the Istrian"). The language, the sources, and the contents of his treatise rule out the possibility that the work was composed in the fifth century, much less by Jerome himself. Clearly the work belongs to the corpus of pseudonymous literature of the early Middle Ages. Professor Heinz Löwe was the first to advance the argument that the work was not only by an Irishman, but by the notorious opponent of St. Boniface, Bishop Virgilius of Salzburg. The case was first presented in "Ein literarischer Widersacher des Bonifatius: Virgilius von Salzburg und die Kosmographie des Aethicus Ister."<sup>72</sup> Löwe's main arguments for the Irish origin of Aethicus are: knowledge and use of *Hisperica Famina*; stylistic influences of Virgilius Maro, knowledge of the *De Mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae*; a word-play involving an Irish etymology, and another concealed in the author's pseudonym Aethicus, i.e., the name refers to *Aethica insula* or *Tír etha*. Löwe's argument for the date and authorship of the work were countered by Maartje Draak,<sup>73</sup> Franz Brunhölzl,<sup>74</sup> and by Kurt Hillkowitz in the second volume of his *Zur Kosmographie des Aethicus*,<sup>75</sup> while the alleged connection of Virgil of Salzburg to Iona was given scant support by Père Grosjean in his "Virgile de Salzburg en Irlande."<sup>76</sup> Professor Löwe has responded to these objections and introduced some new arguments in his "Salzburg als Zentrum literarischen Schaffens im 8. Jahrhundert."<sup>77</sup> A new text of this work is badly needed,<sup>78</sup> and I propose to undertake the task once other pressing projects are completed.

This brings us to work in progress. It would appear that the editing of Hiberno-Latin grammars is at the moment receiving the closest attention. Professor Bischoff has written me that his work on the edition of the *Anonymus ad Cuimnanum*, in collaboration with

B. Taeger, is nearing completion. Bengt Löfstedt informs me that his edition of a Donatus commentary found in Abrosiana L.22 sup. is ready in typescript. He is also planning an edition of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus for the Teubner series.<sup>79</sup> I understand that editions of Hiberno-Latin grammars prepared by his students are to appear in the *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis*.<sup>80</sup> I have prepared an edition of the Hiberno-Latin grammatical miscellany in Amiens 426 (fols. 1-29), which I hope to publish presently.<sup>81</sup>

In December, 1978, I received the good news that Professor Bieler's *The Patrician Texts in the Book of Armagh* were at the first proof stage and so I do not think it will be very long before we have good new editions of *Tírechán* and *Muirchú*. This collection will appear in the *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae*.<sup>82</sup> I do not have an up-to-date report on the status of Dom McGinty's new edition of the *De Mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae*, but I know that we shall all welcome its appearance. Finally, I am able to report that my second volume of *Hisperica Famina* will soon be ready for press.

I was happy to learn that the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from Celtic Sources* is now definitely underway. The project is being sponsored and financed by the Royal Irish Academy. As of November, 1978, the following texts were computerized: *Opera Patricii Episcopi Dublinensis*, *Penitentialia Vinniani*, *Hymnus Secundini*, *Hisperica Famina: The A-Text*, two volumes of the *Periphyseon*, the *Vita Metrica Sanctae Brigidae*, the *Canones Hibernenses*, *Annales Cambriae*, the metrical *Vita S. Senani*, the *Navigatio S. Brendani*, and various Hiberno-Latin poems. I am grateful to Miss Maura Walsh of the Irish Academy project for this information.

I think we can now safely say that Hiberno-Latin has come of age. Many of the major monuments in this area are now in good critical editions, or will be shortly. The commitment to the Hiberno-Latin, or more broadly Celtic, dictionary project should assist not only in the unravelling of the mysteries of arcane words, but also contribute to the establishment of reliable word-histories with all that that entails for cultural history. What remains to be done? The answer is simple: much. We will require editions of many of the exegetical works listed by Bischoff in "Wendepunkte." Father McNamara's article<sup>84</sup> is very useful in this regard, though a few editions have been completed or undertaken since the appearance of that piece. As I noted above, individual stylistic and lexical studies are wanted for even the most major works



of Hiberno-Latin literature. Bibliographical aids and literary guides are also needed. We now possess a sufficient number of critical editions and literary-historical studies to justify, at the very least, an introduction to the history of Hiberno-Latin literature of the same scope as W. F. Bolton's *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature*. For the moment, we are still dependent upon Esposito's scattered papers,<sup>85</sup> Coccia's survey, Bieler's *Ireland, Harbinger of the Middle Ages*,<sup>86</sup> and of course, J. F. Kenney's *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland*, which is now badly in need of up-dating and revision. It goes without saying that attention to this last-named task (perhaps by a team?) would receive universal gratitude.

We still need to know much more about individual areas. The question of what was quintessentially Irish in the syllabic and rhythmical verse of the sixth and seventh centuries, for example, remains unanswered. And although at the moment the evidence looks scanty, we nevertheless need a study of the Irish practice of metrical verse composition in the formative period.<sup>87</sup> The interpenetration of the Latin and Celtic traditions, especially with respect to Irish translations and adaptations of classical literature, should continue to claim our attention. Finally a desideratum addressed to historians of culture and education: as Pierre Riché pointed out in *Education et culture dans l'occident barbare*,<sup>88</sup> a critical history of the schools of Ireland remains to be written.<sup>89</sup>

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>J. F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland: Ecclesiastical*: (rev. L. Bieler, New York, 1966; rep. Dublin, 1979), pp. 82-83.

<sup>2</sup>M. Esposito, "On the New Edition of the Opera Sancti Columbani," *C & M* 21 (1960): 184-201, esp. 196-97.

<sup>3</sup>A detailed and critical survey of earlier attempts to define and characterize Hiberno-Latin is given by B. Löfstedt, *Der hiberno-lateinische Grammatiker Malsachanus* (Uppsala, 1965), pp. 81-86.

<sup>4</sup>W. Most, *The Syntax of the Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae*, Washington D. C., 1946.

<sup>5</sup>Bieler, ed., *The Irish Penitentials* (Dublin, 1963), pp. 27-47; esp. pp. 28-29.

<sup>6</sup>Löfstedt, *Malsachanus*, pp. 154-55.

<sup>7</sup>"Latin scolaire et latin vivant," *ALMA* (Bulletin du Cange) 40 (1975-76): 51-63; esp. 58-61.

<sup>8</sup>See my edition, pp. 73-74; J. Huemer, *Virgilii Maronis Grammatici Opera* (Leipzig, 1886), pp. 114-15, 118, 120, 137, 151. See n. 79, below.

<sup>9</sup>See C. A. Robson, "L'Appendix Probi et la philologie latine," *Le Moyen Age* 69 (1963): 37-54.

<sup>10</sup>Löfstedt, *Malsachanus*, pp. 86-107.

<sup>11</sup>"Sprachliche Eigentümlichkeiten in den hibernolateinischen Texten des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts," to be published in the proceedings of the Tübingen colloquium: "Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter," under the editorship of Heinz Löwe (Stuttgart: Klett-Clotta, 1981).

<sup>12</sup>See Löfstedt, *Malsachanus*, pp. 150-54.

<sup>13</sup>It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the known Latin documents emanating from Ireland and its cultural satellites, including the Latin writings of Saint Patrick, give no support to the influence of "British Latin" upon the written Latin of Ireland. For the main outlines and some refinements of the theory of the influence of "British Latin" on Irish, see K. Jackson, *Language and History in Early Britain* (Edinburgh, 1953), pp. 122-48.



<sup>14</sup>See the detailed and enlightening introduction of A. O. and M. O. Anderson to their edition: *Adomnan's Life of Columba* (London, 1962), pp. 1-175.

<sup>15</sup>Herren, *Hisperica Famina*, pp. 49-54. The problem of the relation of Vulgar Latin to Hiberno-Latin will be treated more fully in my forthcoming "Sprachliche Eigentümlichkeiten," cited above.

<sup>16</sup>See Hincmar's *Opuscula*, PL 126: 448B; and John J. Contreni. *The Cathedral School of Laon from 850 to 930: Its Manuscripts and Masters* (Munich, 1978), p. 22.

<sup>17</sup>I have made a collection of examples in "The Irish Loan Words in Hiberno-Latin," forthcoming.

<sup>18</sup>MS 37 (1975): 410-32.

<sup>19</sup>EC 15, 2 (1978): 553-67.

<sup>20</sup>"The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature," ASE 4 (1975): 68.

<sup>21</sup>For the Irish origin of these two writers, see the discussion below.

<sup>22</sup>"Hisperic Latin: 'Luxuriant Culture-Fungus of Decay'," *Traditio* 30 (1974): 411-19.

<sup>23</sup>"The Background of Early Irish Literature," SH 1 (1961): 13.

<sup>24</sup>See the discussion in the introduction to my edition of the *Hisperica Famina*, pp. 39-44, and my "Some New Light on the Life of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus," *PRIA* 79, C, 2 (1979): 27-71; esp. 57-68. For the interaction of the Latin and Irish traditions in metre, see G. Murphy, *Early Irish Metrics* (Dublin, 1961); on the use of obscure diction, P. McCana, "On the Use of the Term *Retoiric*," *Celtica* 7 (1966): 65-90.

<sup>25</sup>*Vigiliae Christianae* 16 (1962): 216-33.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 219.

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 221.

<sup>28</sup>EC 13 (1972): 275-97.

<sup>29</sup>"A 'Celtic' Hyperbaton?", *BBCS* 27, 2 (May 1977): 207-12.

<sup>30</sup>ASE 6 (1977): 39-76.

<sup>31</sup>"A 'Celtic' Hyperbaton?", p. 211, n. 4.

<sup>32</sup>*Vigiliae Christianae* 30 (1976): 310-17.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 316 and n. 29.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 311.

<sup>35</sup>Diss., Amsterdam, 1971.

<sup>36</sup>*Mittelalterliche Studien* 1 (Stuttgart, 1966): 205-73. An English translation of this article can be consulted in M. McNamara, ed., *Biblical Studies: The Medieval Irish Contribution* (Dublin, 1976).

<sup>37</sup>For a detailed discussion of the triad in the Irish tradition, see P. Sims-Williams, "Thought, Word and Deed: an Irish Triad," *Eriu* 29 (1978): 78-111.

<sup>38</sup>TS 19 (1958): 395-403.

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 395.

<sup>40</sup>See Löfstedt, *Malsachanus*, pp. 22-23, n. 8; and my "Some New Light," pp. 60-62.

<sup>41</sup>The texts by "Sergilius" have been edited by Vivien Law and publication should ensue quite soon.

<sup>42</sup>Smit, pp. 141-46; and my "The Pseudonymous Tradition in Hiberno-Latin," *Latin Script and Letters A.D. 400-900: Festschrift Presented to Ludwig Bieler on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, ed. J. J. O'Meara and B. Naumann (Leiden, 1976), pp. 121-31.

<sup>43</sup>McNally, p. 395, n. 1.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 397-98.

<sup>45</sup>Bischoff, *Mittelalterliche Studien*, 1: 220, n. 64.

<sup>46</sup>*Irish Theological Quarterly* 39, 1 (Jan. 1972): 337-53.

<sup>47</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 341. I note in passing that the above-named article provides a very handy catalogue of the Hiberno-Latin biblical commentaries noted by Bischoff in "Wendepunkte" that have been edited subsequent to 1954, or are in progress.

<sup>48</sup>SM, 3rd ser., 8, 1 (1967): 257-420.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 346.

<sup>50</sup>*Mittelalterliche Studien* 2: 246-75.

<sup>51</sup>Notably the famous Greek inscription of a doxology on the Fahan Mura stone deciphered by R. A. S. Macalister, *Journal of the Royal Society of the Antiquities of Ireland* 59 (1929): 89-98: Δόξα καὶ τίμη <sic> Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ. Also the line "Audite pantes ta erga" in the "Hymnus Sancti Comgilli" (*Antiphony of Bangor*, ed. Warren, 2:16), written no later than 689, shows some very rudimentary knowledge of Greek inflection. The poems "Rubisca" and "Adelphus Adelpha Meter" (ed. F. J. H. Jenkinson, *The Hisperica Famina*, Cambridge, 1908) exhibit a much more impressive command of Greek composition. They probably date to the second half of the ninth century; see the introduction to *Hisperica Famina* 2, Toronto, forthcoming. The recent thesis by Kevin M. Lynch, *Evidences of a Knowledge of Greek in England and Ireland during the Age of Bede* (Duquesne University, 1976), adds very



little to the pre-Carolingian picture.

<sup>52</sup>See W. Berschin, "Abendland und Byzanz," *Reallexikon der Byzantinistik* (Amsterdam, 1971), 1:254. See now Edouard Jeauneanu's judicious remarks in "Jean Scot Erigène et le Grec," *ALMA* 41 (1979): 5-50.

<sup>53</sup>Cited above, n. 16.

<sup>54</sup>In the *Biblioteca degli Studi Medievali*, vol. 4 (Spoleto, 1973).

<sup>55</sup>For an account of these views, see Coccia's survey, *passim*. See also my "Classical and Secular Learning Among the Irish before the Carolingian Renaissance," *Florilegium* 3 (1982): forthcoming.

<sup>56</sup>"Ueber das heiligen Columbas Leben und Schriften, besonders über seine Klosterregal," *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie* 45 (1875): 396-454.

<sup>57</sup>Cited above, n. 2.

<sup>58</sup>Cited above, n. 35.

<sup>59</sup>*SM* 18.2 (1977): 249-314.

<sup>60</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 289.

<sup>61</sup>On the date of Diez B. Sant 66, see Bischoff, *Sammelhandschrift Diez. B. Sant 66: Grammatici Latini et Catalogus Librorum* (Graz, 1973), pp. 21-23; also Lapidge's comments in "Authorship," pp. 286-88.

<sup>62</sup>Coccia, pp. 318-20.

<sup>63</sup>*EHR* 90, no. 357 (Oct. 1975): 798-820.

<sup>64</sup>Coccia, pp. 320-22.

<sup>65</sup>Herren, *Hisperica Famina*, pp. 32-39.

<sup>66</sup>*Idem*, "Some New Light," pp. 42-68.

<sup>67</sup>T. J. Brown, "An Historical Introduction to the Use of Classical Latin Authors in the British Isles from the Fifth to the Eleventh Century," *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* (Spoleto, 1975), pp. 249-50.

<sup>68</sup>Totowa, New Jersey, 1976.

<sup>69</sup>*PRIA*, 70, C, 3 (1970): 13-91. For recent work on an Irish adaptation of a classical tale, see D. O'hAodha, "The Irish Version of Statius' *Achilleid*," *PRIA* 79, C, 4 (1979): 83-137.

<sup>70</sup>See Löfstedt, *Malsachanus*, esp. chs. 1-3 and ch. 6, pp. 55-61 and 71-73. Some revisions of Löfstedt's datings of grammarians will be put forward in V. Law's *The Insular Latin Grammarians*, Woodbridge, forthcoming.

<sup>71</sup>See the papers in the collection edited by McNamara, cited above, n. 46 and the September 1979 issue of *Thought*, which contains essays by Bischoff, Kelly, McNamara, and Glenn Olsen.

<sup>72</sup>*Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse*, 1951, no. 111 (appeared, 1952), pp. 898-988.

<sup>73</sup>*Dancwerf opstellen aangeboden aan D. Th. Enklaar* (Groningen, 1959), pp. 33-42.

<sup>74</sup>*Festschrift für Max Spindler zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. D. Albrecht et al. (Munich, 1969), pp. 75-89.

<sup>75</sup>Frankfurt, 1973.

<sup>76</sup>*AB* 78 (1960): 92-123.

<sup>77</sup>*Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde*, Band 115 (1975): 39-143.

<sup>78</sup>On the need for a new edition, see Wesley Stevens' review of Hillkowitz's *Zur Kosmographie des Aethicus in Speculum* 51 (1976): 752-55.

<sup>79</sup>Since the reading of this paper, a new edition of Virgilius Maro has appeared: G. Polara and L. Caruso, ed. and trans., *Virgilio Marone grammatico, Epitomi ed Epistolae* (Naples, 1979). See now my review, *SM*, 3rd ser., 21.2 (1980): 757-61.

<sup>80</sup>Anna Puckett has made a new edition of Clemens' grammar and John Chittenden, an *editio princeps* of Donatus Ortigraphus (i.e. Artigraphus).

<sup>81</sup>A portion of this work was presented at the Fifth International Celtic Congress, Galway, July 6-13, 1979.

<sup>82</sup>Since this paper was read Professor Bieler's work has appeared bearing the date 1979.

<sup>83</sup>In the Studies and Texts Series of the Press of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto.

<sup>84</sup>Cited above, p. 00. See also the "Bibliography on Hiberno-Latin Biblical Texts" by Joseph Kelly in McNamara, ed., *Biblical Studies*, cited above, n. 36.

<sup>85</sup>The papers of Esposito relevant to Hiberno-Latin are handily listed in the bibliography of Stanford's "A History of Classical Influences," cited above, n. 69.

<sup>86</sup>Reprinted with corrections, London, 1966.

<sup>87</sup>The metrical practices of the ninth-century Hiberno-Latin poet Donatus are catalogued by D. N. Kisane, "Uita Metrica Sanctae Brigidae: a Critical Edition with Introduction, Commentary and Indices," *PRIA* 77, C, 3 (1977): 71-72.



<sup>88</sup>See the English translation by J. J. Contreni, *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West* (Columbia, South Carolina, 1976), p. 311, n.18.

<sup>89</sup>Unfortunately, the new work of Fergal McGrath, S. J., *Education in Ancient and Medieval Ireland* (Dublin, 1979), though useful in a number of respects, does not fulfil this desideratum.

# JOHN SCOTTUS, MARTIN HIBERNIENSIS, THE LIBERAL ARTS, AND TEACHING

John J. Contreni

Purdue University

The Irishmen who came to the continent in the ninth century left a rich record of teaching behind them. One Irishman, by way of exception, felt obligated to point out that he was not skilled in grammar.<sup>1</sup> Most were, however, and have left their glosses and commentaries as witnesses to their role as teachers in the Carolingian realm.<sup>2</sup> Two of these masters offer us a particularly good glimpse of the activities and significance of Irish teachers around the middle of the ninth century. The first, John Scottus, called Eriugena, is of course one of the most prominent Irish masters of the early Middle Ages.<sup>3</sup> His renown centres on his accomplishments as a philosophic thinker, as a translator from Greek, and as an exegete. Only recently have modern scholars begun to illuminate John's role as a teacher.<sup>4</sup> The second Irish master whose teaching career I wish to examine is Martin Hiberniensis (819-875), a contemporary of John who taught in the cathedral school of Laon. I wrote quite extensively of Martin in my book on the cathedral school of Laon and will not repeat that discussion here except in the most general outline.<sup>5</sup> Rather, I want to use this opportunity to look more closely at Martin's teaching by presenting and examining an interesting unpublished text he used in introducing his students to the liberal arts.

Although John and Martin were masters of quite different mettle, their interest in the liberal arts and their notions about the value of learning unite them and afford us a splendid opportunity to learn how and what two Irish masters taught their students.

John was a teacher before his career broadened to include translation and philosophical speculation. It was his teaching in the palace that first brought him to the attention of Carolingian prelates interested in marshalling theological support against the ideas of

*Insular Latin Studies*, ed. Michael Herren,  
Papers in Mediaeval Studies 1 (Toronto:  
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981)

pp. 23-44



Godescalc of Orbais.<sup>6</sup> John entered the world of theological controversy after he had gained a reputation as a commentator on the liberal arts. We have no idea how long John commented on the *De Nuptiis* of Martianus Capella, but I feel certain that it was not simply a passing phase in his career. Several versions of the commentary circulated. It was continually being reworked.<sup>7</sup> John was most concerned to obtain a faithful text of Martianus upon which to comment and worked with an Abbot Winibertus to that end.<sup>8</sup>

The explication of Martianus Capella's allegory of the arts forced John to consider such wide-ranging problems as the division of knowledge, the place of the arts in a Christian education, and the nature of man and the universe. Comment on a work as rich and as obscure as the *De Nuptiis* necessitated familiarity with Greek, mythology, classical literature, and the arts themselves. The requisite training inevitably affected a master's approach to other problems, however, where the intrusion of methods and materials gained in the explication of Martianus Capella were questioned by some. The critique that Prudentius of Troyes made of John's *De Praedestinatione* centred exactly on that point.<sup>9</sup> Prudentius' view was only one. The study of the arts in Christian culture was officially sanctioned and encouraged on the Continent in the *Epistola de Litteris Colendis*, a document which might be called the manifesto of the Carolingian renaissance.<sup>10</sup> Here, Alcuin argued that the proper understanding of Christian wisdom depended upon proper understanding of a written text, the Scriptures. In order to comprehend the profundity of this text, one must be trained in the arts, especially that of grammar. What he was saying, reduced to its simplest terms, is that the search for spiritual wisdom presupposes intellectual training. In another place, Alcuin employed a famous image which enjoyed great success in ninth-century poetry and art.<sup>11</sup> He compared Christian wisdom to a temple supported by seven columns. The columns were the seven liberal arts without which, of course, the temple could not stand. For Alcuin, the arts were not simply a propaedeutic, but an essential element of Christian learning.

In his commentary on the *De Nuptiis*, John completed the Christianization of the arts begun by Alcuin, but along different lines. John's striking metaphysical formulations were studied by Gerard Mathon in his paper at the 1967 international philosophical conference at Montreal.<sup>12</sup> For John, learning was not only an aid towards the achievement of Christian wisdom, but a means of salvation itself: "Nemo intrat in

celum nisi per philosophiam."<sup>13</sup> In another place he equated true wisdom with religion: "Veram esse philosophiam veram religionem, conversimque religionem esse veram philosophiam."<sup>14</sup> In pursuing the study of the arts, in particular, one progresses in perfection since the arts are innate in man. Knowledge of them has been clouded by the fall. Their recovery by study helps to restore man to his pristine state.

John shared these views with other ninth-century masters. Martin Hiberniensis seems, for example, to complement John in his comments on Origen's analysis of the divine source of the arts.<sup>15</sup> The immanence of the arts is clearly formulated by an anonymous ninth-century commentator on the *De Nuptiis*.<sup>16</sup> A propos of Martianus Capella's discussion of accidents in Book 4, John used the example of Cicero's possession of the art of rhetoric and concluded that

Sed quia unaquaeque ars, quamvis propriam quandem naturam suam habeat, in se fieri non potest sed in aliqua subiecta substantia necesse est ut consistat, non est, et ad semet ipsam redire dum alio aliquo continetur. Itaque necesse est ut aliter atque melius intellegamus. Omnis igitur naturalis ars in humana natura posita et concreta est. Inde conficitur ut omnes homines habeant naturaliter naturales artes, sed quia poena peccati primi hominis in animabus hominum et in quandam profundam ignorantiam devolvuntur, nihil aliud agimus discendo nisi easdem artes quae in profundo memoriae repositae sunt in praesentiam intellegentiae revocamus, et cum aliis occupamur curis, nihil aliud agimus artes neglegendo nisi ipsas artes iterum dimittimus ut redeant ad id a quo revocatae sunt.<sup>17</sup>

The neoplatonic theory of recollection that is at the heart of this comment complements John's notion on the immanence of the arts and Martin's belief in the God-given nature of the arts. The important point to be grasped in these texts is the tremendous emphasis given to the arts and to the process of education as a whole. The arts were not merely a convenient schema of knowledge nor simply an important element of Christian wisdom in Alcuin's sense. They have not been created by man, but are a constituent part of his nature. No longer simply a tool, the arts are man's link with the Divine, their cultivation a means to salvation.

It would be difficult to over-estimate the significance of this development. The new emphasis on the place of the arts in Christian education must be seen as one of the chief factors animating the ninth century's intense interest in the arts and the immense labour involved in commenting upon Martianus Capella's work. Remigius of Auxerre, who summed up and transmitted to a wider audience the work of his predecessors, owed his thoughts on the arts to the anonymous commentator on Martianus Capella and to John Scottus.<sup>18</sup>



John's theories about the arts and learning were not confined to the early work on Martianus Capella. The theme occurs at least twice more in the commentary on the *Celestial Hierarchy* and in the *Periphyseon*. In a comment on Pseudo-Dionysius' work, John followed his author in preferring "the seven disciplines which the philosophers call liberal": the sacred disciplines. They are avenues to the knowledge of things. John, however, went beyond the implications of Pseudo-Dionysius when he offered his own "notiore interpretatione." Just as the waters from various sources come together and flow in the bed of one stream, so too are the arts united in the contemplation of Christ, "summus fons totius sapientie." In a concluding aphorism reminiscent of the passages which attracted Mathon's attention, John stated confidently, "Nulla enim sacra scriptura est que regulis liberalium careat disciplinarum."<sup>19</sup> He made this same point earlier in the eighteenth chapter of his treatise on predestination, where he imputed his opponent's failure to understand the holy fathers to ignorance of the liberal arts.<sup>20</sup>

In Book 5 of the *Periphyseon*, John was concerned with explaining the principle that all things return to their sources: "Finis enim totius motus est principium sui."<sup>21</sup> Many examples from the sensible world illustrated his point. The activities of the sun, the moon, the other planets, the air, the ocean, the ebb and flow of the tides, and the cycles of vegetative life "quibus in foetus, flores, folia, fructus erumpant" were all called into play. But the process of return is not limited to the sensible world. It includes also those things which are considered by the mind alone such as "those disciplines which the philosophers call liberal." Eriugena specifically elaborated by showing how dialectic, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy all return to their own particular principles. Arithmetic begins with the monad, progresses through various species of numbers, to return to the monads themselves. Geometry begins with the point, considers planes, solids, angles, depth, surface, longitude, and latitude, which all can be reduced to the point. The Alumnus of the *Periphyseon* saw the wisdom of the Nutritor's explication, but confessed that he could not see why grammar and rhetoric were excluded. John's reply is interesting. Grammar and rhetoric, first of all, are divisions of dialectic. Secondly, those two arts do not concern the natural order, but rather the rules of the human voice which are determined not by nature, but by custom. If that is so, the Alumnus rejoined, why are they counted among the arts if they are not natural but the products of human

machinations? Precisely because, the Nutritor replied, they are joined to dialectic, the mother of the arts, and flow from it like the branches of a river.

This very interesting discussion in the *Periphyseon* introduces a second element into John's teaching. Clearly, not all the arts were created equal. Where did he get his schema? Although we speak of the traditional liberal arts consisting of the trivium and the quadrivium, it is clear that the arts were counted and ordered in a variety of ways in the early Middle Ages. Isidore of Seville, for example, described several different arrangements.<sup>22</sup> In his *De Differentiis Verborum* he presented *sapientia* under these headings: Physics, Logic, and Ethics. Physics includes the seven disciplines of arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy, astrology, mechanics, and medicine. Logic embraces dialectic and rhetoric, while Ethics includes the four principal virtues of prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance.<sup>23</sup> Grammar is nowhere mentioned. This division seems to have been particularly favored by Irish masters. While John's observation that the arts return to their principles seems to reflect his own neoplatonism, his view of grammar and rhetoric as divisions of logic resembles the Hiberno-Latin versions of Isidore's *Differentiae* as presented, for example, by Martin Hiberniensis for whom logic is said to consist of rhetoric and dialectic to which grammar "adheres."<sup>24</sup>

At the conclusion of his investigation of early medieval arrangements of the arts, Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz described such schemes as "un détail érudit, une notice qui se transmet d'un auteur à un autre, qu'un auteur peut contaminer ou modifier d'après ses propres points de vue, sans correspondance pourtant dans la vie réelle de l'enseignement."<sup>25</sup> In the case of John Scottus in the ninth century, this judgment seems unduly pessimistic. John did not simply draw up lists of the arts, but discussed them and their significance in the course of major works: the commentary on the *De Nuptiis*, the *Expositiones* on the *Celestial Hierarchy*, and the *Periphyseon*. In addition, I have mentioned that there seems to be some connection between John's division of the arts and that of Martin Hiberniensis, who certainly did teach from the manuscript (Laon 468) that preserves his thoughts on the subject. We also know, finally, that John's interpretation passed into the work of Remigius of Auxerre, whose commentary on Martianus Capella was the most successful produced in the Middle Ages. A search of the comments of ninth and tenth-century masters might turn up additional echoes of



John's theories. The opening lines of an eloquent poem written by an anonymous ninth-century master who knew John's work seems to be one indication of the currency of John's theories. The master opened his poem in which he lamented his early attachment to Martianus Capella with the statement, "In the first flower of my life, I was clever in the arts/by which the highest, one God is worshipped."<sup>26</sup>

This anonymous master affords a convenient transition to the second portion of my remarks on John's teaching career. What precisely is the evidence for the transmission of his teaching to his own generation? The author of the poem whose opening lines I have just cited apparently knew John since he copied two Eriugenian distichs of a rather light nature onto the flyleaf of his Vergil manuscript. He also prefaced a translation of a Byzantine hymn to the Virgin in the same manuscript with several verses from John's poem on the Incarnation.<sup>27</sup> This kind of evidence, admittedly, is not entirely satisfying. However, the fact is that only two of John's students are named for us. One, Bishop Elias of Angoulême (861-875), an Irishman, is mentioned in a tenth-century source of questionable reliability.<sup>28</sup> Reference to the second disciple is more certain. The authors of the Deeds of the bishops of Auxerre recorded that their Bishop Wicbald (879-887) studied at the feet of John Scottus, whose rays of wisdom diffused throughout Gaul. Wicbald was proficient in divine and human learning. His biographers, however, noted that his first instruction under John's direction was in the liberal arts.<sup>29</sup>

This meagre class roll can be lengthened by a consideration of masters whose links to John's teaching are not so directly expressed. Almann of Hautvillers, Hucbald of Saint-Amand, Heiric of Auxerre Sedulius Scottus, and Martin Hiberniensis are the most prominent masters who were influenced by John's teaching during his lifetime.

Almann, who was called a philosopher in his own right, reflected the teaching of John in his vocabulary.<sup>30</sup> Hucbald, who taught in the archdiocese of Reims, although apparently after John's death, compiled a florilegium of Eriugenian thoughts.<sup>31</sup> Heiric, the student of Lupus of Ferrières and of Haimo of Auxerre, was on intimate terms with Wulfad, the abbot of Saint-Merard in Soissons and later archbishop of Bourges (866-876) whom John Scottus graced in the *Periphyseon* with the title "scholarly collaborator." Heiric was the first master both to cite the *Periphyseon* and to draw upon John's sermon, *Vox Spiritualis*.<sup>32</sup> Sedulius Scottus borrowed from John's *Annotations* in the course of his

own commentary on Donatus Maior.<sup>33</sup> Martin included Greek words from John's poetry among the teaching texts he compiled in his Greek-Latin glossary and grammar.<sup>34</sup> This brief listing offers impressive testimony to contradict the general notion that John was a figure isolated by his genius in the ninth century. He was part and parcel of the scholastic currents of his time. Elements of his teaching survived in the notes of his students and colleagues. Several additional references, unlike the ones to which I have just alluded, were made by anonymous masters.

Whoever owned Paris, B. N., lat. 12949, a compilation of logical treatises and glosses that distinguish this book as one of the most interesting school books of the Carolingian period, quoted a fragment from one of John's poems that alludes to the temple of wisdom and also cited John for the definition of a Greek word.<sup>35</sup> A series of Vergil manuscripts preserve references to the *periochae* of John as guides to understanding the life of the poet.<sup>36</sup> A medical recipe for the removal of hair cites the oral testimony of John on the subject.<sup>37</sup> An anonymous ninth-century author of a letter asked his correspondent how his community sings the response when the antepenult is sharp "*secundum doctrinam Iohannis Scotti*." Interestingly, the author's very next question concerned the definition of the mechanical arts which he learned from Manno, apparently John's successor at the palace school at Compiègne.<sup>38</sup> References to John, placed marginally opposite texts relevant to his teaching, occur scores of times in a manuscript loosely associated with the circle of Sedulius.<sup>39</sup>

Finally, I wish to draw attention to two recently discovered, but as yet anonymous, figures whose notes reflect intimate contact with John Scottus. The first is known to modern students of Eriugena simply as "i<sup>2</sup>," one of the two Irish hands found in the margins of John's works. The hand "i<sup>1</sup>" has been identified as that of John himself. The unknown "i<sup>2</sup>" was not simply a scribe. He was responsible for original notes that mark him as a student of the great Irish master.<sup>40</sup> Another contemporary of John, this time a continental scholar, has recently been brought to light by Edouard Jeuneau. A series of glosses that he left in Paris, Bibl. de la Mazarine, 561, John's translation of the *Ambigua* of Maximus the Confessor, betray, according to Jeuneau, if not the thought of Eriugena himself, the thought of "a disciple who had perfectly assimilated his teaching."<sup>41</sup>



These direct and indirect references to John's teaching no doubt can be augmented.<sup>42</sup> Who, to cite one example, was the Stephanus who owned the ninth-century Reims copy of the *Periphyseon*? All that can be said thus far is that he was a contemporary of Hincmar of Laon, who presented Reims, Bibl. mun. 118 to him, and thus, could well have known personally the author of the *Periphyseon*.<sup>43</sup> Without being absolutely certain that I have canvassed every ninth-century reference to John as a teacher, I think that sufficient evidence has been brought to bear on the widespread impact John's teaching had on contemporaries.

I want now to turn briefly to a consideration of several Eriugenian texts that offer us our earliest look at John the teacher. I have already mentioned that the *Annotationes* on Martianus Capella exists in several versions and that it was continually revised in light of Eriugena's ongoing commentary on the *De Nuptiis*.<sup>44</sup> Another text pre-eminently pedagogical is the series of biblical glosses ascribed to John and about which I wrote in 1976.<sup>45</sup> Since that study, I have been able to examine in greater detail what appears to be the earliest surviving manuscript (Paris, B.N., Lat. 3088) of the biblical glosses. From the five hundred or so glosses which survive, we can gain a good sense of John's early teaching. He was not commenting on texts as we usually understand that procedure. His notes explain words that refer to weights, measures, monetary values, place names, animal and plant life, vestments, and ornaments. The explanations are predominantly etymological and depend frequently upon the works of Pliny and Isidore of Seville. In relatively few instances are the notes more than a phrase or two in length. The suggestion that these notes emanated from elementary instruction at an early point in John's life is strengthened by the presence of about eighty Old Irish glosses. Old Irish presumably was used in the presence of young Irish students whose experience and command of Latin vocabulary were not yet sufficiently sophisticated. What remains to be determined about these glosses is not so much at what point in his career John taught them, but rather where he taught them. Was it in Ireland or on the continent? The fact that the five surviving manuscripts are all continental leads me to believe that the glosses were used in both locales. John would naturally use Irish among his compatriots to explain an unfamiliar biblical term more clearly. He could also continue to use Irish words on the continent, as the manuscripts testify, where they could be affected by continental pupils. Hincmar of Laon, at least, liked to sprinkle his prose with

Irish words, learned perhaps from John.<sup>46</sup>

To the *Annotationes* and the biblical glosses, I want tentatively to add a very similar teaching text to John's dossier. In the Paris manuscript mentioned above, the glosses end abruptly at the bottom of folio 115v after a few notes on the preface to the book of Daniel. The succeeding quire or quires have been lost. What follows in the remaining fragment of the manuscript is a series of new glosses picked up in *mediis rebus* and copied by the same hand responsible for the biblical glosses. This second set of notes extends from the top of folio 116r to the bottom of 121v where they too are suddenly terminated by the loss of following quires. Approximately two hundred explanations of words, predominantly Greek, drawn from forty letters in the correspondence of St. Jerome remain. These glosses are more developed than those on the bible. They include definitions of words such as *phantasia* and *theophania* that were part of John's intellectual vocabulary. The method, essentially etymological, is reminiscent of the biblical notes. Persius, Servius, Donatus, Nonius Marcellus, and Plautus are among the authorities cited. Most of these references, however, are secondary since they are derived from Isidore of Seville's *Origines* from where almost the entire body of notes on Jerome's vocabulary has silently been drawn. This extremely close reliance on the Spaniard prohibits me at the moment from ascribing the notes definitely to Eriugena. If my further examination should prove them an authentic work of John Scottus, we shall have not only a new text to add to his dossier, but also another important witness to his career as a teacher. There can be no doubt concerning the connection between Martin Hibernensis and a series of teaching texts contained in Laon, Bibl. mun., 468. Martin wrote part of this most interesting book, corrected it throughout, and made notes in its margins. It has all the hallmarks of a teaching tool copied under his direction and used by him during his career as the *magister Laudunensis*.<sup>47</sup>

In certain respects more is known of Martin than of John.<sup>47</sup> Martin's birth and death dates as well as a substantial portion of his library have survived. Martin was not the controversialist or striking original thinker that his compatriot was. He knew Lupus of Ferrières and had connections at the palace of Charles the Bald, but there is no indication that his reputation travelled much farther during his life or lived on very long after it. Martin is valuable precisely because he seems to be more typical than John of both Carolingian and Hiberno-



Latin scholarship. With the exception of his knowledge of Greek, which was unusual and seems to have derived from Ireland, his curriculum could be duplicated by many Carolingian masters. Much of his teaching depended upon compilations that he either inherited or put together himself. One such teaching book is Laon, Bibl. mun., 468, a manuscript which ought to be published in facsimile as an excellent representative of ninth-century teaching manuals. To my knowledge, only one part of it has been published and it has never been studied in its entirety.<sup>48</sup> The book opens with a life of Vergil and continues with excerpts from Servius' prefaces to the Vergilian corpus. A guide to the Muses, Fates, gods and goddesses is followed by a short section, ff. 9r-11r, that seems out of place in this manuscript, but which is germane to our study of Hiberno-Latin pedagogy on the arts.<sup>49</sup>

DE PROPRIETATE PHILOSOPHIAE ET DE VII LIBERALIBUS ARTIBUS fol.9r

Omnis philosophia in tres species dividitur, id est in phisicam, aethicam, logicam. Fisis enim natura, aethis mos, logos verbum vel ratio, quod est in naturalem, moralem, rationalem. Phisica autem in quattuor divisiones partitur, id est arithmetica, geometrica, musica, astronomia quibus adhaerent astrologia, et medicina, et etiam minores artes quas aratores, et fullones, et cimentarii exercent.

Phisicam vero invenit Tales milesius. Aethicam invenit Socrates et divisit eam in iiii virtutes, id est prudentiam, iustitiam, fortitudinem, temperantiam. Logicam invenit Plato et divisit eam in duas partes, id est in rethoricam et dialecticam quibus adhaeret grammatica. In grammatica enim scientiam recte loquendi discimus. In rethorica vero percipimus qualiter ea quae didicimus proferamus. In his etiam tribus generibus philosophiae omnis divina scriptura consistit. Philosophia etiam dividitur in duas partes, id est in contemplativam et actuaalem. Contemplativa vero in tres partes dividitur, id est in naturalem, doctrinalem, divinam. Actualis autem similiter in tres dividitur partes, id est in moralem, dispensativam, civilem.

Proprietates vii liberalium artium. Grammaticus, litteratus, id est qui bene scit litteras. Rethoricus vel rethor, id est eloquens qui bene scit litteras et bene potest eas loqui. Rethorica enim *ANOTON PECERIN* dicitur, id est ab

*hac copia locutionis. PECIC enim grece locutio dicitur. Ad ipsam pertinent tria genera causarum et iiii genera orationum et silogismi et lex et sententia et catascevae et anascevae et prosopopeia et ethopoeia. Dialectica dicitur quia de dictis disputat. Lecton enim grece dictio dicitur. Tanta est enim ibi disputandi facultas et loquendi, ut in disputando vera secernat a falsis. Ad ipsam enim pertinet maxime philosophia et Isagogae Porphyrii et catagoriae / et periermeniae in fol. 9v quibus maxima subtilitas continetur et etiam silogismi et xv genera diffinitionum et topica.*

Arithmetica et geometrica, musica, et astronomia generaliter mathematicae nominantur, id est doctrinales. Arithmetica id est numeralis, arithmon enim greci numerum dicunt, quam scriptores saecularium ideo inter disciplinas mathematicas primam esse voluerunt, quoniam ipsa nulla alia indiget disciplina.

Geometrica autem et musica et astronomia quae secuntur ut sint atque subsistant istius egent auxilio. Non possunt enim esse sine numero. Geometrica dicitur terrae mensuratio sive aliarum rerum. Ge enim terra; metron, mensura. Ad ipsam enim pertinent longitudes, latitudines, magnitudines, figurae variae, quadrangulum, triangulum, et figurarum numeri. Musica ars, id est peritia modulationis sono cantuque consistens. Et dicta musica per dirivationem a Musis. In ipsis est enim modulatio et per ipsas quaerebatur antea vis carminum et modulatio vocis.

Ad ipsam pertinent tres species, id est armonica, organica, rithmica. Armonica est omnis modulatio quae ex voce profertur. Organica est omnis modulatio quae spiritu flante completur ut in tubis, cornibus, fistulis, reliqua. Rithmica est omnis modulatio quae fit per chordas ex digitis. Nulla enim disciplina potest esse perfecta sine musica nam ipse mundus sine ipsa non volvitur et in omnibus sonis fit musica.

Astronomia id est astrorum lex. Astrologia, astrorum verbum. Inter astronomiam et astrologiam hoc differt quod astronomia ad certam rem pertinet, astrologia ad certam et incertam. Ad incertam enim pertinet dum in stellis auguriatur. Caelum a caelando secreta dicitur et est volubile, grece uranos dicitur. Sphaera species caeli est in rotundum formata et ex omnibus partibus aequaliter conclusa, ipsa est enim rotunditas caeli.



65 Axes caeli sunt duo, id est septemtrionalis qui numquam nobis  
occidit et australis et dicuntur axes quia in ipsa sphaera  
volvitur sicut rota in plaustro vel quia ibi plastrum Iovis  
est. Qui duo axes dicuntur et poli. Dicti autem poli quod fol.10r  
sint cicli axium / ex usu plastrorum a poliando scilicet  
nominati. Cardines caeli extremae partes axis sunt et dicti  
70 ita eo quod per eos vertitur caelum. Convexa caeli sunt eius  
extrema et a curvitate dicta quia ibi curvatur nobis caelum.  
Ianuae caeli duae sunt, id est oriens et occidens, per ipsas  
enim procedit sol. Climata vel plagae caeli sunt iiii id est  
oriens, occidens, septemtrio qui vertex dicitur, australis.  
75 Quinque circuli etiam caeli sunt, id est septemtrionalis,  
solstitialis, aequinoctialis, brumalis, australis. Inter-  
lunium est inter xxx et primam lunam. Stella est quaelibet  
singularis. Sidus plurimis stellis fit ut plades, reliqua.  
Astra autem stellae grandes ut orion. Septem planetae sunt  
80 in caelo quae ideo dicuntur planetae eo quod errant contra  
mundum quasi ANO NANEK, id est ab errore.

#### DE INVENTIONE LIBERALIUM ARTIUM

Aristotelis invenit rethoricam et dialecticam. Pitagoras  
invenit arithmetica et musicam. Egiptii primum invenerunt  
85 geometricam. Caldei et Egiptii primi invenerunt astrologiam.  
Greci tamen dicunt eam invenisse primo Athlantem unde dixerunt  
eum sustinere caelum. Ypocrates invenit medicinam artem et  
medicina dicitur a modo, id est temperamento ut non satis sed  
paulatim adhibeatur. Immoderatio enim omnis non salutem sed  
90 periculum affert. Ad ipsam enim pertinet cibus et potus,  
tegmen et defensio omnis corporis.

Silogismus grece, latine argumentatio dicitur. Silogismus  
igitur est propositionis et assumptionis confirmationisque  
extrema conclusio, ut est occidisti, inimicus es, occidisti  
95 enim. Catascheua est confirmatio propositae rei. Anascheua  
autem contraria est superiori. Revincit enim non esse, quod  
natum, aut factum, aut dictum esse proponitur. Prosopopeia  
est cum fingitur persona et sermo inanimalium rerum ut dicuntur  
montes et flumina et arbores et patria loqui. Ethopoeia  
100 vero est in qua personam hominis fingimus pro exprimendis  
affectibus aetatis, videlicet studii, fortu<nae>, laetitiae,

sexus, meroris, audaciae. Nam cum piratae persona accipitur  
audax oratio demonstratur. Pirata enim est latro marinus qui  
fiunt multum / audaces cum vero feminae sermo simulatur, fol.10v  
sexui convenire oratio debet et mollis. Hic nunc diximus de 105  
sexu et audacia. Quaere si vis de aetate, studio, fortuna,  
reliqua. Haec ad rethoricam pertinent.

Isagoga grece, latine introductio dicitur eorum scilicet  
quae philosophiam incipiunt. Genus introducitur enim ad  
demonstrandam proprietatem, species, differentia, proprium, 110  
accidens, ut puta, homo (id est species) est animal (genus)  
rationale (differentia), mortale (differentia ab angelis),  
risibile (proprium), sensus disciplinaeque (accidens) capax.  
Ista enim v introducuntur in Isagogis. Catagoriae grece, latine  
praedicamenta dicuntur quibus per varias significationes omnis 115  
sermo conclusus est. Categoriarum autem species x sunt, id est  
substantia, quantitas, qualitas, relatio, situs, locus, tempus,  
habitus, agere et pati, ut est hoc exemplum: Augustinus (substan-  
tia), magnus (quantitas), orator (qualitas), filius illius  
(relatio), stans (situs), in templo (locus), hodie (tempus), 120  
infulatus (habitus), disputando (actus), fatigatur (passio).  
Istis enim x praedicamentis universitas constat.

Periermeniae grece, latine interpretamenta dicuntur in  
quibus maxima subtilitas fit. Omnis quippe res, quae una est  
et uno significatur sermone, aut per nomen intelligitur aut 125  
per verbum; quae duae partes interpretantur totum quicquid  
conceperit mens ad eloquendum. Periermenia enim dicitur  
interpretamentum per nomen et verbum ex affirmatione et nega-  
tione, ut Cicero disputat, Cicero non disputat. Ita sibi opponun-  
tur, ut dum vivit Cicero alterum eorum necessario sit. Et 130  
ipso mortuo falsum est quod disputat, verum tamen est quod non  
disputat. Aut stultus est ille aut sapiens, quamdiu vivit  
horum alterum verum est; cum ipse esse destiterit utraque  
falsa sunt, quia ille qui non est neque stultus neque sapiens  
esse potest, reliqua. In qua periermenia vii species fiunt, id 135  
est nomen, verbum, oratio, enuntiatio, affirmatio, negatio,  
contradictio. Utilitas enim periermeniarum tanta est ut ex his  
interpretamentis etiam silogismi fiant. Topica sunt sedes  
argumentorum vel loca, id est sedes dialecticae artis, / id est fol.11r  
loca ubi de argumentis disputatur. Haec ad dialecticam pertinent. 140



M=Martinus Hiberniensis 4 logos ex logus 36 Arithmetica, -h- suprascr.  
 45 magnitudines, M suprascr.: scilicet ut in campis et vineis videtur  
 46 numeri, M in marg. <e>t liniamenta 58-60 M in marg.: <C>AELO  
 ET <PAR>TIBUS <EIU>S 68 poliendo, M suprascr.: id est ornando, ornantur  
 enim et planantur a rotis 72 M in marg.: convexum enim curvum dicitur  
 85 Caldei, M in marg.: ut abraham 85 egiptii, cod. egiptii 95  
 Anascheua, M in marg.: id est redargu<unt> impugna<nt> 101 affectibus,  
 M in marg.: id est voluptatibus 109 Genus, in marg. addit M 111-121  
 (id est species) - (passio) suprascr. 112 (differentia), M hab.  
 (diferentia)

2 Omnis - 7 medicina, Isidore of Seville, *Differentiae*, 2.39 (PL 83:  
 93d-94a) 7 et etiam - 8 exercent, Jerome, *Ep.* 8, 6 (ed. Hilberg, 1: 452,  
 10-13) 9 Phisicam - 13 dialecticam, Isidore of Seville, *Origines* (ed.  
 W. M. Lindsay), 2.24,4-7 13 In grammatica - 15 proferamus, *Orig.* 2.2.2  
 15 In his - 21 civilem, *Orig.* 2.24.8-11 25 Rethorica enim - 26 dicitur,  
*Orig.* 2.1.1 26 Ad ipsam - 29 ethopoeia, *Orig.* 2.4.7,9-14 29 Dialectica-  
 35 topica, *Orig.* 2.12.14,25-30 36 Arithmetica - 42 auxilio, *Orig.* 3.1  
 43 Geometrica - 46 numeri, *Orig.* 3.10; 46 Musica - 55 musica, *Orig.*  
 3.15. 1; 3.19; 3.21. 1; 3.19.1; 3.20.1; 3.22; 3.17.1  
 57 Astronomia - 81 errore, *Orig.* 3.24, 27, 32, 36-40, 42, 44, 55, 60,  
 67 83 Aristotelis - 91 corporis, *Orig.* 2.2.1; 2.22.2; 3.2.1; 3.16.1;  
 3.10.1; 3.25.1; 4.3; 4.2.1 92 Silogismus - 107 pertinent, *Orig.* 2.11.1;  
 2.12.1; 2.13.1-2; 2.14.1-2 107 Isagoga - 140 pertinent, *Orig.* 2.25.1,  
 5-8; 2.26.1-2; 2.26.5,11; 2.27.1-4, 7; 2.29.16; 2.30.1

Martin's manuscript continues with short descriptions of philo-  
 sophers, poets, sibyls, magicians, and pagan deities, drawn largely  
 from Fulgentius the Mythographer, before it arrives at the principal  
 texts in the book, a long unpublished glossary on Vergil (ff. 18r-51v:  
 "De epythetis Virgilii") and a similarly unedited glossary on the  
 letters of the poet Sedulius (ff. 52r-61v).

Obviously much of the text on the arts is derivative. Its general  
 organization, its debt to the *Differentiae*, and even the brief excerpt  
 from a letter of Jerome place it among a series of Hiberno-Latin texts  
 on the arts. Before examining its place in this tradition, I think it  
 important to point out that the compiler, if he is not Martin himself,

has skilfully moved through books 2, 3, and 4 of the *Origines* for most  
 of his material, not slavishly copying out Isidore's text but condensing  
 it, rephrasing it, and sometimes rearranging it to fit his organization.  
 A few examples will indicate his approach to his sources. At lines 15-  
 16, where our text has "In his etiam tribus generibus philosophiae omnis  
 divina scriptura consistit," Isidore (*Orig.* 2.24.8) reads: "In his  
 quippe tribus generibus philosophiae etiam eloquia divina consistunt."  
 In substituting "omnis divina scriptura" for "eloquia divina," Martin's  
 text has condensed three lines in the *Origines* where Isidore referred  
 to the specific biblical books. In line 17, Martin's text has preferred  
 the word *contemplativa* for one of the parts of philosophy in place of  
 Isidore's *inspectiva* (*Orig.* 2.24.9).

The process of selection and abridgment quite often involved more  
 than a change in a word or two. Concerning music, the two texts say  
 essentially the same thing, but Martin's text seems simpler and more  
 direct.

*Orig.* 3.17.1

lines 54-56

Itaque sine Musica nulla dis-  
 ciplina potest esse perfecta,  
 nihil enim sine illa. Nam et  
 ipse mundus quadam harmonia  
 sonorum fertur esse conpositus,  
 et caelum ipsud sub harmoniae  
 modulatione revolvi.

Nulla enim disciplina potest  
 esse perfecta sine musica, nam  
 ipse mundus sine ipsa non  
 volvitur et in omnibus sonis  
 fit musica.

Isidore's famous distinction between astronomy and astrology has  
 been similarly paraphrased in the Laon manuscript where particular care  
 seems to have been taken to avoid describing the "certain" knowledge  
 that astrology might yield.

*Orig.* 3.24; 3.27.1-2

lines 57-60

Astronomia est astrorum lex...  
 Inter Astronomiam autem et Astro-  
 logiam aliquid differt. Nam Astro-  
 nomia caeli conversionem, ortus,  
 obitus motusque siderum continet,  
 vel qua ex causa ita vocentur.  
 Astrologia vero partim naturalis,  
 partim superstitiosa est.  
 Naturalis, dum exequitur solis

Astronomia, id est astrorum  
 lex. Astrologia, astrorum  
 verbum. Inter astronomiam  
 et astrologiam hoc differt  
 quod astronomia ad certam rem  
 pertinet, astrologia ad certam  
 et incertam. Ad incertam enim  
 pertinet dum in stellis  
 auguriatur.



et lunae cursus, vel stellarum  
certas temporum stationes. Super-  
stitiosa vero est illa quam  
mathematici sequuntur, qui in  
stellis auguriantur....

This process of distillation of another's work is not surprising in early medieval pedagogy. One would hardly expect a master to create definitions of the arts, their properties, and their invention. One would, however, expect a master to reword and rearrange material to fit his own needs which in Laon 468 were not to serve as a full-blown disquisition on the arts, but rather to provide an introduction to the arts in a book dedicated primarily to grammatical study.

Martin was not alone among Irish masters in incorporating a discussion of the arts and the division of wisdom in a grammar book. The *Anonymus ad Cuimnanum* of the seventh century with its schema prefaces an Irish commentary on Donatus Maior in a manuscript from the first half of the eighth century.<sup>50</sup> Virgilius Maro included a discussion of the divisions of wisdom in his chapter on metrics.<sup>51</sup> It was as if, Díaz y Díaz has remarked, grammatical tradition demanded a general discussion of the classification of the arts in order to justify the emphasis accorded grammar.<sup>52</sup>

The organization of Martin's text reinforces what its context reveals of its tradition. The text may be divided into four sections. The first and shortest section, lines 2-21, treats the properties of philosophy and the arts. The schema here comes from Isidore's *Differentiae*, a source already mentioned above as favoured by John Scottus and other Irish masters. A second source, a passage from Jerome's fifty-third letter, is also called upon when Martin elaborates on the minor arts. The same Hieronymian passage was also cited in the letter to Cuimnanus.<sup>53</sup> The second section, lines 22-81, abandons the schema of the *Differentiae* when it describes the properties of the seven "traditional" liberal arts as discussed in Isidore's *Origines*. In the third section, lines 83-91, Martin's text returns to the schema of the first section when it lists briefly the subdivisions of logic and physics (rhetoric, dialectic, arithmetic, music, geometry, astrology, and medicine) and their inventors. Grammar which "adheres" to dialectic in the view of the *Differentiae*, is conspicuous by its absence. Two long paragraphs, lines 92-140, on rhetoric and dialectic terminate the text on the arts.

The organization of Martin's text poses several questions. Why, first of all, does it oscillate between two schemes of the arts? And secondly, why did Martin conclude his notes after elaborating upon only two of the arts, rhetoric and dialectic? One might answer the first question by stating that rival schemata for the arts were implicit in Isidore himself and in Martin's predecessors, as Bischoff and Díaz y Díaz have shown in their studies of the problem. For the solution to the second question, I would suggest that Martin's material reflects parts of yet another schema, one that was entered into early Alcuin manuscripts between texts of the Anglo-Saxon's *Dialogus de Rhetorica et Virtutibus* and his *De Dialectica*.<sup>54</sup> The unknown early Carolingian master responsible for this elaborate table encompassing the divisions of rhetoric, philosophy, and the virtues has much in common with the tradition from which Martin's material drew. He divided Philosophy into Physics, Ethics, and Logic. Physics he broke down into the seven-fold division familiar from the *Differentiae*. Logic consisted of dialectic and rhetoric. Before he considered the division of Ethics into the four principle virtues, the master treated dialectic separately, having already analyzed rhetoric at the beginning of his schema. Martin's manuscript does not include any material on Ethics and in the discussion of rhetoric is not as elaborate as the similar discussion in the Alcuin manuscripts. Nevertheless, the existence of the schema, which closely resembles the organization of Martin's text and which served as a kind of bridge between Alcuin's pedagogical works on rhetoric and dialectic, offers a precedent, to be sure, although misapplied in a Virgil manuscript, for concluding a discussion of the arts with two paragraphs on rhetoric and dialectic.

The final question is perhaps the most important of all. What did all these traditions have to do with Martin's actual teaching? Were they as Díaz y Díaz has written "un détail érudit"? In the case of Martin, the evidence is clear that the few leaves devoted to the arts in his manuscript were not there for his own edification or to display his erudition to his colleagues. They were intended to serve as the basis for his actual teaching. Martin's marginal notes, introduced by an "id est" or a "scilicet," show Martin clarifying his text for his students.<sup>55</sup> At lines 105-107 we even hear the master gently prodding his students to do some work on their own; "Hic nunc diximus de sexu et audacia. Quaere si vis de aetate, studio, fortuna, reliqua."



## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Scottus Peregrinus Roma Redux Beneficium Expetit, MGH Epistolae 6: 196.1: "Non sum grammaticus neque sermone Latino peritus..."

<sup>2</sup>Although in obvious need of updating, J. F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland: Ecclesiastical* (New York, 1929; rep. 1966), especially chapters 6 and 7, is the most convenient guide to the work of Irishmen on the continent. More recently, see the fine editions of the grammatical works of Murethach and Sedulius Scottus prepared by L. Holtz and B. Löffstedt in CCCM vols. 40, 40A, 40B, 40C.

<sup>3</sup>To the fundamental study of M. Cappuyns, *Jean Scot Erigène: sa vie son oeuvre, sa pensée* (Louvain, 1933; rep. Brussels, 1969), must now be added the introduction to E. Jeauneau, ed., *Jean Scot: Homélie sur le prologue de Jean*, Sources chrétiennes, no. 151 (Paris, 1969), as well as the studies published in J. J. O'Meara and L. Bieler, eds., *The Mind of Eriugena* (Dublin, 1973), and in *Jean Scot Erigène et l'histoire de la Philosophie, Laon, 7-12 juillet 1975* Colloques internationaux de Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, no. 561 [Paris, 1977]. Of great help is M. Brennan, "A Bibliography of Publications in the Field of Eriugenian Studies, 1800-1975," *SM*, 3rd Ser., 18, 1 (1977): 401-47.

<sup>4</sup>See G. Mathon, "Les formes et la signification de la pédagogie des arts libéraux au milieu du IXe siècle: L'enseignement palatin de Jean Scot Erigène," in *Arts libéraux et philosophie au Moyen Age* (Actes du quatrième congrès international de philosophie médiévale [Paris and Montreal, 1967]), pp. 47-64; pp. 19-24 in Jeauneau's edition cited in n. 3 above and his "Quisquilliae e Mazarinaeo codice 561 depromptae," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 45 (1978): 79-129; J. J. Contreni, "The Biblical Glosses of Haimo of Auxerre and John Scottus Eriugena," *Speculum* 51 (1976): 411-34; as well as several studies in the acts of the Dublin and Laon colloquia cited in the previous note.

<sup>5</sup>*The Cathedral School of Laon from 850 to 930: Its Manuscripts and Masters*, Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung, vol. 29 (Munich, 1978).

<sup>6</sup>Florus of Lyon, "De Tribus Epistolis Liber," PL 121: 1052. See also Cappuyns, pp. 53-59, and Kenney, pp. 575-77 (no. 381).

<sup>7</sup>See G. Schrimpf, "Zur Frage der Authentizität unserer Texte von Johannes Scottus' 'Annotationes in Martianum'," in *The Mind of Eriugena*, pp. 125-39.

<sup>8</sup>See J. J. Contreni, "A propos de quelques manuscrits de l'école de Laon au IXe siècle: Découvertes et problèmes," *Le Moyen Age* 78 (1972): 9-14; and, idem, "The Formation of Laon's Cathedral Library in

the Ninth Century," *SM* 3rd Ser., 13 (1972): 933.

<sup>9</sup>*De Praedestinatione contra Joannem Scotum*, PL 115: 1013d-1014a; and Kenney, pp. 577-78 (Nos. 382-85).

<sup>10</sup>MGH *Leges* 2, *Capitularis Regum Francorum*, 1: 78-79 (no. 29). For Alcuin's part in the redaction of this letter, see L. Wallach, *Alcuin and Charlemagne: Studies in Carolingian History and Literature*, rev. and amended reprint (New York, 1968), pp. 198-226.

<sup>11</sup>*De Grammatica*, PL 101: 853. Its significance and fortuna have been studied by M. Th. d'Alverny, "La Sagesse et ses sept filles: Recherches sur les allégories de la Philosophie et des arts libéraux du IXe au XIIe siècle," in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de Félix Grat*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1946-49), 1: 245-78.

<sup>12</sup>See n. 4, above, for Mathon's paper, and d'Alverny, pp. 250-51.

<sup>13</sup>C. E. Lutz, ed., *Iohannis Scotti: Annotationes in Marcianum*, Mediaeval Academy of American Publications no. 34 (Cambridge, Mass., 1939), p. 64.

<sup>14</sup>*De Divina Praedestinatione Liber*, PL 122: 358a.

<sup>15</sup>See Contreni, *Cathedral School of Laon*, pp. 115-17.

<sup>16</sup>See Cora E. Lutz, ed., *Dunchad Glossae in Martianum* (Lancaster, Pa., 1944), pp. 22-23. For the authorship of this commentary, see J. J. Contreni, "Three Carolingians Texts Attributed to Laon: Reconsiderations," *SM*, 3rd ser., 17, 2 (1976): 802-13.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 23: "But although any individual art might have a nature appropriate to itself, it cannot exist in itself but must exist necessarily in some subordinate substance (as a ground); therefore, it is not able to come from itself if it does not exist in itself and cannot return to itself so long as it is contained in some other substance. Thus it is necessary that we understand (accident) in a different and better way. Every natural art (therefore) is found materially in human nature. It follows that all men by nature possess natural arts, but because, on account of the punishment for the sin of the first man, they (are obscured) in the souls of men and sunk in a profound ignorance, in teaching we do nothing but recall to our present understanding the same arts which are stored deep in our memory. And when our minds are occupied with other cares, in neglecting the arts we do nothing but let go of them as they return to that from which they have been recalled."

<sup>18</sup>Cora E. Lutz, "Remigius' Ideas on the Classification of the Seven Liberal Arts," *Traditio* 12 (1956): 65-86; and d'Alverny, p. 251.

<sup>19</sup>J. Barbet, ed., *Iohannis Scotti Eriugenae Expositiones in Ierarchiam Coelestem*, CCCM (Turnhout, 1975), 31: 16 (lines 540-61).

<sup>20</sup>*De Divina Praedestinatione Liber*, PL 122: 430c.

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*, cols. 866a-870c.



<sup>22</sup>See J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1959), 1: 345-49; and Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz, "Les arts libéraux d'après les écrivains espagnols et insulaires aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles," in *Arts libéraux et Philosophie au Moyen Age*, (cited above, n. 4), p. 40.

<sup>23</sup>*Differentiae* 2.39 (PL 83: 93d-95c).

<sup>24</sup>See the text printed below, lines 12-13. Hiberno-Latin discussions of the arts have been studied by B. Bischoff, "Eine verschollene Einteilung der Wissenschaften," in *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1966), 1: 273-88, esp. p. 286. (This study originally appeared in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 25 [1958]:5-20. See also Díaz y Díaz, pp. 42-46.

<sup>25</sup>Díaz y Díaz p. 46.

<sup>26</sup>C. Leonardi, "Nuove voci poetiche tra secolo IX e XI," *SM* 3rd ser., 2 (1961): 150. "Sollers artis eram prima florente iuventa / Qua colitur summus, unus et ipse Deus."

<sup>27</sup>See Contreni, *Cathedral School of Laon*, pp. 140-41.

<sup>28</sup>See L. Delisle, "Notice sur les manuscrits originaux d'Adémar de Chabannes," *Notices et extraits* 35-1 (1896): 311-12.

<sup>29</sup>*Gesta Episcoporum Autisiodorensium*, MGH *Scriptores* 13: 399, 12-18.

<sup>30</sup>See A. Wilmart, "La lettre philosophique d'Almanne et son contexte littéraire," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 3 (1928): 285-319.

<sup>31</sup>G. Mathon, "Un florilège érigénien a l'abbaye de Saint-Amand au temps d'Hucbald," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* 20 (1953): 302-311.

<sup>32</sup>For Heiric, see R. Quadri, *I Collectanea di Eirico di Auxerre* (Fribourg, 1966): E. Jeauneau, "Dans le sillage de l'Erigène: Une homélie d'Héric d'Auxerre sur le prologue de Jean," *SM* 3rd ser., 11 (1970): 937-55; idem, "Influences érigéniennes dans une homélie d'Héric d'Auxerre," in *The Mind of Eriugena*, pp. 114-23. For John's reference to Wulfad, see PL 122: 1022a.

<sup>33</sup>B. Löffstedt ed., *Sedulius Scottus In Donati Artem Maiorem*, CCCM, 40B (Turnhout, 1977): 95.57-59.

<sup>34</sup>Laon, Bibl. 444, ff. 294v-96v ("Item greca de versibus Iohannis Scotti"), ff. 297r-298v ("Item versus grecismi"). See MGH *Poet. Lat.* 3: 540-42; and Cappuyns, pp. 77-78.

<sup>35</sup>See the apparatus criticus for MGH *Poet. Lat.* 3: 537, (no. 8, II.1 and 3); Jeauneau, "Quisquilliae," p. 117, n. 109; and Kenney, p. 591 (no. 402).

<sup>36</sup>See J. Brummer, *Vitae Vergilianae* (Leipzig, 1912), p. 62, lines 64-73, for the ninth-century Wolfenbüttel, Bibl. Herzog-August 4374 (Gud. lat. 70); idem, "Zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der sogenannten Donat-Vita des Vergil," *Philologus* 72 (1913): 287-91; J. J. Savage, "The Scholia in the Virgil of Tours, Bernensis 165," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 36 (1925): 163; M. Petschenig, "Eine vita Vergilii," *Wiener Studien* 4 (1881): 168-69; P. Lehmann, "Von den Quellen und Autoritäten irisch-lateinischer Texte," *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1959-62), 3: 143-48, for Sankt Paul im Lavanttal 86b/1.

<sup>37</sup>See Kenney, p. 588, no. 398; and, J. J. Contreni, "The Study and Practice of Medicine in Northern France during the Reign of Charles the Bald," in J. Sommerfeldt and E. R. Elder, eds., *Studies in Medieval Culture*, 6 and 7 (Kalamazoo, 1976):45. I am preparing an edition of the remedy.

<sup>38</sup>MGH *Epistolae*, 6: 184, lines 20-22. See Contreni, "Three Carolingian Texts," pp. 798-802.

<sup>39</sup>For Bern Burgerbibliothek 363, see Kenney, pp. 559-60 (no. 364, ii), and my forthcoming "The Irish in the Western Carolingian Empire According to James F. Kenney and Bern, Burgerbibliothek 363." The names of other Irishmen, particularly that of Sedulius Scottus, also appear in the codex.

<sup>40</sup>For this master, see T. A. M. Bishop, "Autographa of John Scot," in *Jean Scot Erigène et l'histoire de la Philosophie*, pp. 89-94; and, in the same volume, B. Bischoff and E. Jeauneau, "Ein neuer Text aus der Gedankenwelt des Johannes Scottus," pp. 109-16.

<sup>41</sup>"Quisquilliae," p. 128.

<sup>42</sup>The Eriugenian definition of *scolia* discussed by Jeauneau, "Quisquilliae," pp. 105-07, also appears in Paris, B. N., lat. 5095, a manuscript from the late ninth century. During the same period, or more probably early in the tenth century, a tradition that a certain Aldelmus was John's brother circulated. See Contreni, *The Cathedral School of Laon*, pp. 87-88. When Hincmar of Reims ridiculed his nephew, Hincmar of Laon, for using *Scottica et alia barbara* in his writings, was he indirectly lashing out at John who used his native language in teaching? See PL 126: 448b.

<sup>43</sup>See H. Loriguet, *Reims*, 2 vols., *Catalogue général des bibliothèques publiques de France: Départements*, vols. 38-39 (Paris, 1904-1906) 1: 109-12, and 2: 191-92, for manuscripts 118 and 875. For Hincmar's connection with MS 118 see Contreni, *Cathedral School of Laon*, p. 33, n. 9, indirectly confirmed by J. Devisse, *Hincmar, archevêque de Reims, 845-882*, 3 vols. (Geneva, 1975-76), 3: 1486, n. 6. There has been no comment, as far as I know, on the identity of Stephanus of Reims.

<sup>44</sup>See above, note 7.

<sup>45</sup>See above, note 4.

<sup>46</sup>See above, note 42.



<sup>47</sup>See Contreni, *Cathedral School of Laon*, ch. 8 ("Martin Hiberniensis [819-875], Magister Laudunensis" and ch. 9 ("The Reading of Martin Hiberniensis").

<sup>48</sup>See Contreni, "A propos de quelques manuscrits," pp. 14-28, where I published and discussed a life of Vergil from ff. 1r-2r. In many places Martin supplied words in the text in spaces left blank by the principal copyist. My first thought was that the copyist encountered Irish abbreviation symbols with which he was unfamiliar and left them for the master to decipher (*ibid.*, p. 27). Suzanne Martinet, in her general discussion of the text presented below, "Les arts Libéraux à Laon au IXe siècle, in *Actes de 95e Congrès des Sociétés savantes* (Reims, 1970): *Section de philologie et d'histoire jusqu'à 1610*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1975), 1: 61-62, suggested that the copyist had difficulty with the Tironian notes of his exemplar.

<sup>49</sup>Words supplied by Martin in the text have been italicized. His other additions are listed in the apparatus. I have retained the orthography of the manuscript, but have expanded *e caudata* to *-ae-*.

<sup>50</sup>See Bischoff, "Einteilung der Wissenschaften," pp. 282-88.

<sup>51</sup>See Díaz y Díaz, pp. 43-44, who presents other examples.

<sup>52</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 44. Marius Victorinus provided the precedent for appending a discussion of the arts to a grammatical treatise. See his *Ars Grammatica* in H. Keil, ed., *Grammatici Latini*, 6 (Leipzig, 1874): 187-88.

<sup>53</sup>Bischoff, "Einteilung der Wissenschaften," pp. 284-85.

<sup>54</sup>See PL 101: 947-48, esp. paragraphs 9-12 of the schema. See also Bischoff, pp. 275-76.

<sup>55</sup>Martin's references in lines 39 and 60 to the agricultural world are not casual allusions. In his copy of Origen's homilies on Numbers, Laon, Bibl. mun. 298, f. lv, Martin calculated the harvests from various fields and thus would seem to have been involved in managing the cathedral's lands.

# THE PRESENT STATE OF ANGLO-LATIN STUDIES

Michael Lapidge

University of Cambridge

The last years of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth were halcyon days for the study of Anglo-Latin literature. In these years the foundations of the subject were laid by a number of scholars of prodigious industry and learning, working in various parts of the world. In retrospect, the most astonishing feature of the learning of these men was its incomparable range - embracing first-hand knowledge of manuscripts and other primary sources of disparate nature such as charters or annals, ancillary disciplines such as liturgy or patristic thought, as well as intimate acquaintance with the tradition of Latin literature, classical and medieval. I am thinking of British scholars such as Charles Plummer, whose edition of Bede's historical writings<sup>1</sup> is likely never to become outdated; or W. H. Stevenson, whose edition of Asser<sup>2</sup> is a treasury of information for the darkest period of Anglo-Saxon history, and whose edition of the Crawford charters<sup>3</sup> sets the model for the way such documents should be treated; or W. M. Lindsay, whose unrivalled knowledge of the Latin language allowed him to establish the bases on which the study of glossaries<sup>4</sup> - an essential aspect of the education of Anglo-Saxon and all other non-Latin speaking cultures - could proceed. In America a number of scholars active in the early decades of the twentieth century provided later students of Anglo-Latin with tools which have become indispensable: E. A. Lowe, with whose *Codices Latini Antiquiores*<sup>5</sup> every study of early insular culture must begin; M. L. W. Laistner, whose census of Bede manuscripts<sup>6</sup> is the starting point for serious work on that author, and whose editions of Bede's exegetical writings should be regarded as models for scholars editing insular biblical commentaries;<sup>7</sup> or

*Insular Latin Studies*, ed. Michael Herren,  
Papers in Mediaeval Studies 1 (Toronto:  
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981)  
pp. 45-82



C. W. Jones, whose edition of Bede's computistical works sets the confusing obscurities of medieval computus in a clear light for the first time.<sup>8</sup> In Germany, a series of scholars involved in the production of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*<sup>9</sup> provided later scholarship with a series of veritably monumental editions of Anglo-Latin texts that are unlikely to be superseded, at least in the foreseeable future: Ernst Dümmler's editions of Alcuin's poems and letters,<sup>10</sup> Michael Tangl's edition of the Bonifatian correspondence,<sup>11</sup> Rudolf Ehwald's edition of Aldhelm,<sup>12</sup> and editions of a number of minor Anglo-Latin texts (such as the *Miracula Nyniae*) by Karl Strecker.<sup>13</sup> One of these MGH editors deserves to be remembered with particular esteem by students of Anglo-Latin: Wilhelm Levison. His editions of the vitae of Boniface are peerless,<sup>14</sup> and his book *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*,<sup>15</sup> perhaps the finest monograph available on an Anglo-Latin subject, ought constantly to be emulated both in the breadth of its subject matter and in the painstaking accuracy of its detailed documentation. Without these men, we might still be working in the Dark Ages which they succeeded in illuminating. They were giants; and we are the dwarves standing on their shoulders.

The death of Levison in 1947 hatched (if I may borrow a phrase from Pope) "a new Saturnian age of Lead." It is perhaps inevitable that the age succeeding that of great pioneers will be less inclined to break further new ground, more inclined to draw back, recast and popularize the work of the predecessors. Hence the succeeding age has been characterized by works of popularization (one thinks of several monographs by E. S. Duckett<sup>16</sup>) and translation. Editions of Anglo-Latin works undertaken by scholars such as Bertram Colgrave<sup>17</sup> and Alistair Campbell<sup>18</sup> often lacked critical judgement and historical perspective, and will eventually need to be redone. So too the work of this more recent period has often been characterized by unfamiliarity with primary sources (particularly in manuscript) and inexperience with the peculiarities of Anglo-Latin. Two volumes published in 1967 could potentially have been valuable instruments of research, but unfortunately fell short of realizing that potential: J. D. A. Ogilvy's *Books Known to the English 597-1066*<sup>19</sup> and the first volume of W. F. Bolton's *History of Anglo-Latin Literature*.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, during the last decade one has sensed a quickening of interest in Anglo-Latin studies - witnessed (say) by the amount of space devoted to bibliography of Anglo-Latin research in periodicals such as *Anglo-Saxon*

*England and the Old English Newsletter*. The conference at York University (of which the present volume records the proceedings) similarly attests to this quickening interest. In the remarks that follow, I shall attempt to give further evidence of this interest; but I shall be most concerned with drawing attention to those areas which (in my opinion) are deserving of scholarly pursuit.<sup>21</sup>

It is generally accepted that the Augustinian mission in the early seventh century left no identifiable trace in later Latin records. Although we know from Bede that Latin teachers were available at Canterbury in the 630s, and that by 644 at least one native Englishman had been trained in Latin to a sufficient degree to be ordained bishop (Ithamar of Rochester), we have no idea of what books were used by the early Italian missionaries, or what methods they employed in instructing the uncouth English.<sup>22</sup> However, some faint traces of Italian influence deriving from Augustine's mission may be detectable in the earliest Anglo-Saxon diplomas, as Pierre Chaplais has argued;<sup>23</sup> and more may come to light. But until the time of Theodore and Hadrian there is no tangible evidence of Latin culture in England. Henceforth, we are better informed. Hadrian will no doubt remain a shadowy figure (he appears in our records only as a correspondent of Aldhelm, and possibly of Julian of Toledo<sup>24</sup>), but we have more evidence - although it is scattered widely - for assessing the impact of Theodore.<sup>25</sup> As evidence of Theodore's impact, Bede noted that there are students surviving in his day "who knew Latin and Greek just as well as their native tongue" (*HE* IV.2). Theodore's Greek learning in particular has left discoverable traces in our records. Most importantly, Professor Bischoff has drawn attention to a series of biblical glosses (on the Pentateuch and gospels) in an eleventh-century manuscript in Milan (Ambros. M.79 sup.); these combine knowledge of Greek patristic literature with that of Anglo-Saxon weights and measures.<sup>26</sup> Since Theodore is mentioned as an authority at one point, Bischoff has inferred that the glosses derive directly from his teaching. The most interesting feature of the glosses is the wide range of Greek patristic authorities from which they quote: John Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nazianzen, and others. Bischoff is preparing an edition of these glosses - one of the principal desiderata of Anglo-Latin studies - and our assessment of Theodore's impact must clearly await the publication of his edition. The question then to be put is: how many of the Greek patristic texts did Theodore bring with



him to England, and how many was he simply quoting from memory? A preliminary answer concerning one of the texts may, perhaps, be given. Peter Kitson, in a recent study of the tradition of the Old English lapidary,<sup>27</sup> has demonstrated that a work of Epiphanius underlies Anglo-Saxon lapidary tradition, and has conjectured that the (otherwise rare) Greek text of Epiphanius may have been known at Canterbury in Theodore's time, whence the later English tradition derived. Other Greek texts were certainly studied there. A Greek acrostic poem on the day of judgement, beginning IHΘΥΣ ΧΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟΣ ΕΝΘΡΩΠΕΥΤΑΥΡΟΣ was apparently translated into Latin hexameters at Canterbury,<sup>28</sup> since Aldhelm on four occasions quotes from the Latin translation. Similarly, Edmund Bishop demonstrated that a Greek litany preserved in the so-called "Aethelstan Psalter" (London, British Library, MS Cotton Galba A.xviii) must have come to England in the late seventh century, since a Latin translation of it is found in the earliest Anglo-Saxon prayer book, British Library, MS Royal 2.A.xx;<sup>29</sup> it is not unreasonable to think of Theodore in this connection. When scattered evidence such as this has been collected, we may be able to form a clearer notion of the Greek studies under Theodore's direction described by Bede.

Curiously, Aldhelm, does not appear to have learned any Greek. But his accomplishment in Latin - bearing in mind that he was of the first generation in Wessex to be converted to Christianity - was prodigious. His knowledge of classical Latin poetry, for example, was not rivalled by any subsequent Anglo-Saxon scholar; he even knew certain classical works such as Lucan's *Orpheus*, which has not survived and is known principally from Aldhelm's quotation of it.<sup>30</sup> In spite of the availability of Aldhelm's works in the excellent edition by Ehwald,<sup>31</sup> he has not received the attention he deserves - no doubt because of the prolixity and difficulty of his Latin. In an attempt to make Aldhelm more accessible to students of Anglo-Saxon culture, Michael Herren and I have recently published a translation of Aldhelm's prose writings;<sup>32</sup> a second companion volume of his poetic works (translated by James Rosier and myself) is scheduled for publication next year. These translations will, hopefully, draw the attention of Anglo-Saxonists to Aldhelm. Meanwhile, Aldhelm's Latin style has recently been attracting scholarly attention, such that we have now come a long way from the earlier facile view which regarded Aldhelm (and anything else which proved difficult to translate) as "Hisperic." I would mention an extensive and excellent article by Michael Winterbottom<sup>33</sup> which

elucidates the continental origins of Aldhelm's mannered prose; and two brief but incisive articles (one by François Kerlouégan,<sup>34</sup> the other by John Marenbon<sup>35</sup>) which clarify the nature and sources of Aldhelm's vocabulary. But much essential work on Aldhelm remains to be done; I would signal two areas of especial importance.

First, the canon of Aldhelm's writings. For the past fifty years, his canon has more or less been fixed on what is printed between the covers of Ehwald's edition, and is now in need of some reconsideration. I have recently suggested,<sup>36</sup> for example, that a colophon to the first of the rhythmical poems printed by Ehwald as anonymous - which runs *finit carmen Aldhelmi* - is to be accepted on the highest authority (the manuscript in question, Vienna 751, was probably copied at Mainz from an exemplar compiled by Lul<sup>37</sup>) and that this, the most interesting of the octosyllabic *carmina rhythmica* emanating from Aldhelm's circle, is in fact by the master himself. Likewise, we know from Bede (*HE* IV.2) that computistical studies were part of the curriculum at Canterbury, and from Aldhelm's letter to Leuthere<sup>38</sup> that he was struggling with the complexities of the subject. This aspect of Aldhelm's learning has been neglected; but in a number of manuscripts, of either English origin or from continental centres with English connections, is found a lunar table which is described as *Ciclus Aldelmi de cursu lunae per signa xii secundum grecos*.<sup>39</sup> Although this table was not known to Ehwald, I see no reason not to regard it as Aldhelm's.

Another work which has been conjecturally attributed to Aldhelm<sup>40</sup> and which has recently attracted a considerable amount of scholarly attention, is the *Liber Monstrorum*,<sup>41</sup> a compilation which, as its title fairly indicates, contains brief descriptions of some 120 monsters, beasts, and serpents. The work is unquestionably of Anglo-Saxon origin, as may be seen from the orthography of the earliest manuscripts and in particular of the name *Hyglac*, the Geatish king who figures prominently in *Beowulf*. There is even some late evidence to suggest that the work travelled in manuscript under Aldhelm's name.<sup>42</sup> However, although the *Liber Monstrorum* shares many sources (such as Lucan's otherwise unknown poem *Orpheus*) and stylistic features with Aldhelm, I am hesitant to attribute it to Aldhelm.<sup>43</sup> But the question deserves further study.

A second area deserving of study is Aldhelm's sources. The extent of Aldhelm's reading was vast, and a study of his sources would give us a clear index to what books were available in Southumbria in the late seventh century. Such a study might take the form of



Laistner's model essay, "The Library of the Venerable Bede,"<sup>44</sup> but would ideally be supplemented by an account of the circulation of each text in manuscript in early medieval Europe (here Lowe's *Codices Latini Antiquiores* would provide the starting point). I think that such supplementary information is necessary because otherwise we may be liable to misjudge an alleged verbal echo (Manitius, for example, thought he could detect borrowings from Corippus in Aldhelm;<sup>45</sup> but these are extremely tenuous, and the text of Corippus appears never to have left Italy<sup>46</sup>), or to misrepresent the number of books at his avail. For example, in the prose *De Virginitate* Aldhelm apparently drew his accounts of exemplary virgins from some twenty separate *passiones*. I doubt that these would have come to him singly; but our knowledge of the compilation and circulation of passionals in this early period<sup>47</sup> (and, indeed, in the later period<sup>48</sup>) is too hazy to allow of any estimate. Much may be learned from research in related disciplines. In a recent and continuing series of articles, J. E. Cross<sup>49</sup> has been studying the sources of the *Old English Martyrology*, using as the basis for his investigations a (personal) microfilm collection of all known pre-tenth-century passionals. As his work progresses, we will be able to get some impression of what, if any, passionals were available to the ninth-century compiler of the *Martyrology* in Mercia, and perhaps by extension backwards, what could have been known to Aldhelm a century earlier. A forthcoming study of the pre-Conquest library at Malmesbury by Rodney Thomson may also throw a light on Aldhelm's sources.<sup>50</sup> It is essential, at any event, that knowledge gained from these various avenues of approach be co-ordinated.

Aldhelm was unquestionably the most proficient, but he was by no means the only, Latin writer active in Southumbria in the late seventh and early eighth century. Boniface and his correspondents attest to the immediate influence of Aldhelm's stylistic propensities but, although their correspondence is accessible in Tangl's excellent edition<sup>51</sup> and a number of serviceable translations,<sup>52</sup> it has seldom received the attention it merits. This collection can now be supplemented by other examples of early Anglo-Latin correspondence which have recently come to light. Pierre Chaplais, for example, has demonstrated that a letter of Bishop Wealdhere of London to the archbishop of Canterbury preserved in London, British Library, MS Cotton Augustus 11.18, is in fact original, and is thus the earliest extant "letter close" from medieval Europe.<sup>53</sup> Patrick Sims-Williams has edited a

previously unknown letter in a Boulogne manuscript (74 [82]) written by one Burginda, who was active (as he thinks) at Bath Abbey in the late seventh or early eighth century.<sup>54</sup> Burginda was not as polished a writer as some of Boniface's female correspondents, but the works which she paraphrases and quotes (Vergil, Arator, and the anonymous *Carmen ad Flavium Felicem de Resurrectione Mortuorum*) reveal fairly ambitious reading in Latin poetry. (Incidentally, the *Carmen....de Resurrectione Mortuorum* is not mentioned in Ogilvy's *Books Known to the English 597-1066*, but was clearly available in early Southumbria, since Boniface in his *Enigmata*<sup>55</sup> also repeats one of its lines: another indication that our knowledge of what authors were studied in Anglo-Saxon England needs constant revision.) Nor was Burginda as accomplished as the English nun Hygeburg of Heidenheim,<sup>56</sup> whose extremely peculiar Latin has recently been the subject of a monograph by Eva Gottschaller,<sup>57</sup> and who deserves to be better known by students of Anglo-Latin.

There are many other aspects of Anglo-Latin culture in early Southumbria which have been receiving attention lately. The early Anglo-Saxon grammarians, especially Tatwine<sup>58</sup> and Boniface,<sup>59</sup> have been the subject of a number of editions and studies in recent years. An exhaustive edition and commentary of Boniface's *Ars Grammatica*, which has been prepared by Vivien Law,<sup>60</sup> will enable a sound evaluation to be made of what grammatical writings were available at Nursling (*Nhutscele*) in the late seventh century. Dr. Law's studies have also succeeded in identifying a number of short grammatical tracts of undoubted insular origin, such as the *Declinationes Nominum* or the *Coniugationes Verborum*, which are preserved only in later continental manuscripts but which were demonstrably known to and employed by Boniface and Tatwine; her forthcoming edition of these will do much to elucidate the study of Latin in early Anglo-Saxon England.

Hand in hand with the study of grammar went the study of metre. Each of the major Anglo-Latin authors of this early period - Aldhelm, Boniface, and Bede - devoted himself to the composition of a treatise on metre.<sup>61</sup> It is interesting to ask how the theory of metrics as set out in treatises such as these squares with the metrical practices of early Anglo-Latin poets. The Anglo-Saxons, we should not forget, were the first non-Latin speaking peoples to be faced with the problems of extensive metrical composition, and many of the finer points of quantitative verse (such as elision, ictus, or the various pauses



within the line) must have eluded them at first.<sup>62</sup> Neil Wright has been undertaking a detailed investigation of Anglo-Latin metrical practice,<sup>63</sup> and the preliminary results of his researches look very promising. It is demonstrable, to cite one instance, that Aldhelm and other Southumbrian poets found entirely different ways of dealing with elision and internal caesurae from those adopted by Bede and the Northumbrian poets. Such a demonstration will have important consequences. For example, the collection of forty *enigmata* by one Eusebius<sup>64</sup> is commonly attributed to an abbot of Wearmouth-Jarrow name Hwaetberht who (as we learn from Bede's commentary on Samuel) bore the cognomen *Eusebius*.<sup>65</sup> However, the metrical practices of the enigmatist Eusebius differ so strikingly from those of Bede and the Northumbrian poets - while agreeing with those of Southumbrian poets - that this Eusebius is almost certainly a Southumbrian; he is not, therefore, identical with Hwaetberht of Wearmouth-Jarrow. And such a conclusion would square better with what other evidence we have: all other known authors of collections of *enigmata* (Aldhelm, Tatwine, and Boniface) were Southumbrian.<sup>66</sup> One further example: in *HE* V.8 Bede has occasion to quote eight elegiac verses from the epitaph of Archbishop Theodore. Once again the metre of these verses is strikingly Southumbrian. Furthermore, the epitaph is stuffed with phrases which recur frequently in Aldhelm's poetry: *lingua Pelasga*, *consortia uitae*, *ciuibus angelicis*, etc. I would suggest that the author of Theodore's epitaph was Aldhelm himself, though such suggestions should best wait until Neil Wright's comprehensive study of Anglo-Latin metrical practice has been published.

I have dwelled at length on Southumbrian Anglo-Latin writers because, in general, the Latin culture of late seventh and early eighth century Northumbria has been more thoroughly studied, is better understood, and consequently presents fewer urgent scholarly problems. The most lavish Northumbrian manuscripts have been studied in detail and have been (or are being) edited in facsimile.<sup>67</sup> Above all, the edition of the works of Bede in the series *Corpus Christianorum* proceeds apace. As one might expect, the quality of these editions is variable;<sup>68</sup> those done by C. W. Jones excel in their comprehensive knowledge of manuscripts and their conscientious accuracy in establishing Bede's sources.<sup>70</sup> But the day is not too far distant when we will be able to read Bede's works in modern editions and not be obliged to rely on the often deplorable editorial work of Giles and Heerwagen.<sup>71</sup> This state of fairly satisfactory affairs regarding Bede is perhaps

reflected in the fact that a recent symposium to mark the thirteenth centenary of Bede's birth could devote so much of its time to peripheral matters.<sup>72</sup>

With Alcuin in the late eighth century a different situation obtains. Some of Alcuin's writings are available in sound editions - notably the poems and letters, edited by Dümmler for the MGH a century ago.<sup>73</sup> Even Dümmler's work may be in need of some revision: in recent studies of the manuscript tradition of Alcuin's poem on York, Peter Godman has been able to demonstrate that several previously unidentified manuscript sources lie behind the transcripts of the poem made by seventeenth-century antiquaries such as Ruinart and Gale, and these discoveries may well necessitate a new edition of this, Alcuin's best-known, poem.<sup>74</sup> For the majority of Alcuin's writings, however, there is no more recent edition than that of Forster Froben (1777), which was reprinted in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vols. 100-101. Most of Alcuin's vast corpus of Latin writing is therefore urgently in need of re-edition, but, because of its immensity, the task is a formidable one. It will be alleviated somewhat when the census of Alcuin manuscripts, currently being prepared by Donald Bullough and David Ganz, has been published (its publication should put the study of Alcuin on the same secure footing which the publication of Laistner's handlist of Bede manuscripts put the study and edition of Bede after 1943). Many of the works printed by Froben can no longer be attributed to Alcuin,<sup>75</sup> and further work is needed on the canon of his writings.<sup>76</sup> To mention two examples: the early *Vita S. Iudoci* has been tentatively claimed for Alcuin,<sup>77</sup> but to my knowledge no one has ever seriously examined this claim, nor investigated Alcuin's hagiographical writings as a whole; and a vast florilegium preserved in the tenth-century manuscript Bamberg B.II.10 and compiled *ab Alchonio leuita* is certainly by Alcuin. This florilegium<sup>78</sup> contains excerpts from scripture (Books 1 and 2), from patristic writings (Book 3), and various antiphons, litanies, hymns and excerpts from Christian Latin poets (Book 4) such as Caelius Sedulius, Juvenius, Arator, Prosper, Dracontius, Venantius Fortunatus, Aldhelm, and Bede. When printed, this florilegium will illuminate many aspects of Alcuin's work, and will give a sound index to what Christian writings and sentiments he considered most important as well as some hint of what versions of the various texts (biblical, patristic, etc.) were available to Alcuin (at York?) in the late eighth century. In short, although several aspects of Alcuin's activity have been



studied - his contribution to liturgical reform,<sup>79</sup> his anti-heretical writings,<sup>80</sup> his work as biblical scholar<sup>81</sup> - it is too early to form an overall estimate of this indefatigable Anglo-Saxon scholar.<sup>82</sup>

Alcuin's impact on Charlemagne and on Carolingian education has frequently been emphasized; but much less is known about his influence on students and followers who remained behind in York, which is the particular concern of students of Anglo-Latin literature.<sup>83</sup> I would draw attention to several works. First, a metrical calendar which, according to Wilmart,<sup>84</sup> was composed at York ca. 800; it is relevant to Alcuin because it is the earliest calendar to commemorate the feast of All Saints on 1 November, a feast which Alcuin was active in popularizing on the continent. Second, the *Miracula Nyniae*,<sup>85</sup> a poem of some five hundred lines which was sent to Alcuin *per fideles nostros discipulos, Eboracensis aeclesiae scolasticos*<sup>86</sup> and which is preserved uniquely in the aforementioned manuscript from Bamberg; the poem was arguably written at York.<sup>87</sup> Thirdly, the poem *De Abbatibus*<sup>88</sup> by one Aethilwulf, an account of the lives of the abbots of an unidentified monastic cell of Lindisfarne. We do now know where in Northumbria Aethilwulf wrote his poem, but it shares a number of phrases with the *Miracula Nyniae*, and both its structure and its diction are modelled on Alcuin's much longer poem on the church of York; I suspect that *De Abbatibus* was not written too far from York. Finally, there are the so-called "York Annals," a series of entries for the years 732-802, which are buried in the *Historia Regum* attributed to the early twelfth-century precentor at Durham, Symeon.<sup>89</sup> These "York Annals" bear a striking relationship to some of the entries in Alcuin's poem on York (e.g. the annals mention the deaths of two anchorites named Balthere and Echa - who are otherwise known only from Alcuin's poem). In the latter years of the eighth century, the annals focus on the affairs of Charlemagne, and it is hard not to believe that the annalist(s) derived much information directly from Alcuin. Significantly, the annals cease at about the time of Alcuin's death in 804. And shortly thereafter, the record of Latin culture in Northumbria comes to an end.<sup>90</sup>

The ninth is the darkest century in the record of Latin culture in England. At its very beginning, there are the few writings I have just mentioned; at its very end - the last decade - there is the literary activity in Wessex centred on Alfred: but in between the record is virtually blank, except for a small number of Latin diplomas. The Vikings are blamed for this extermination of Latin culture, and

rightly so, no doubt. But it should not be forgotten that Alfred was able to find a number of learned men in Mercia near the end of the century,<sup>91</sup> which allows the supposition that (in western Mercia at least) the study of Latin had continued. It is simply that those responsible for its continuation left no writings of their own, in Latin, which have come down to us.<sup>92</sup> For that reason our attention is thrown back on the ninth-century diplomas I have mentioned.<sup>93</sup> These diplomas have their own interesting story to tell about Latin culture in the ninth century. Nicholas Brooks<sup>94</sup> recently drew attention to a series of original Latin charters which were written at Christ Church in the 850's and 860's, and in particular, to the occurrence of one scribe whose documents span the years 855 to 873, and who was apparently the principal scribe - and by 873 the only scribe - of the archiepiscopal writing office. His latest charter<sup>95</sup> is replete with grammatical errors, repetitions and omissions, which suggest that he was no longer able to see what he had written. That no trained and literate scribe could be found in Canterbury to replace this aging blind man testifies to the sad state of learning at the time, and provides an interesting confirmation of Alfred's statement that he could not find a single literate man south of the Thames when he acceded to the throne (in 871).<sup>96</sup>

For this period, then, as throughout the Anglo-Saxon period, Latin charters are a valuable index to the state of literacy which obtained at a given place and time, and it is much to be regretted that they are not more frequently consulted by students of Anglo-Latin literature. There are good reasons for their neglect, of course: they are for the most part available only in inadequate nineteenth-century editions, and, more importantly, a formidable amount of expertise is needed to distinguish (say) a genuine ninth-century charter preserved in a fourteenth-century cartulary from a charter forged in the twelfth century from ninth-century models - a situation which is exacerbated by the lack of any handbook whatsoever to the problems of Anglo-Saxon diplomatic.<sup>97</sup> Nevertheless, the British Academy is sponsoring the re-edition of all surviving Anglo-Saxon charters and, when all volumes have been published, they will be an indispensable tool to students of Latin culture. Two volumes have so far appeared.<sup>98</sup> These are edited in a form more useful to historians - who are more likely to be interested in the exact location of the boundary of an estate - than to philologists, who are more likely to be interested in the exact meaning



of an obscure word in the (almost invariably) verbose poem. Some rapprochement between philologists and historians is desirable in these matters. The most recent volume is provided with a glossary of difficult Latin words in the charters, and future volumes are to follow this format. In any case, the Anglo-Saxon diplomas are richly deserving of attention from students of Anglo-Latinity; such attention would, in turn, be of considerable benefit to historians.

In the period before the tenth century, the narrow sea of Anglo-Latin literature has been moderately well charted. With the tenth century, the scholar active today is faced with a vast expanse of relatively uncharted ocean. The task of charting this ocean lies ahead; and it is no mean task, for a variety of reasons. From the middle of the century onwards, largely from the impetus of the Benedictine reformers, scriptoria in various English monastic centres became very active, with the result that, even today, hundreds of manuscripts written in England between (say) 950 and 1025 survive; many of these have yet to be identified, and the majority has yet to be adequately described and catalogued. The situation is compounded by the fact that, from the beginning of the tenth century onwards, large numbers of manuscripts were imported into England from the continent; and these too remain to be identified, described, and catalogued.<sup>99</sup> The result is that the contents of a majority of the manuscripts which were available in late Anglo-Saxon monastic libraries are improperly known. Until they are better known, any account of Latin culture in tenth-century England must be superficial. It is perhaps unnecessary to add that many Anglo-Latin writings in these manuscripts await discovery. The identification of poetic texts in manuscript will be immensely facilitated by Schaller and Könsgen's new and indispensable *incipitarius* of pre-1100 poems;<sup>100</sup> for prose texts one proceeds by trial and error.<sup>101</sup> At any rate, it will be many years before we can speak with confidence about the resources of tenth-century Anglo-Latin literature.<sup>102</sup>

The question is greatly complicated by the problem of continental influence on tenth-century English intellectual life. A few years ago Donald Bullough remarked that "'England and the Continent in the Tenth Century' is one of the unwritten works of early medieval historiography."<sup>103</sup> It cannot yet be written. I have mentioned the large numbers of manuscripts imported into England in the tenth century awaiting study. Equally important, and equally in need of

study, are the continental schools and libraries which exerted the greatest influence on English scholars at that time: St. Peter's in Ghent, Corbie, and Fleury. Until these centres have been more thoroughly studied, it will not be possible to estimate the impact a sojourn at one of them may have had on an Anglo-Saxon monk, or what books and ideas a scholar from one of them might have imported to England. What is needed for each of them is a study along the lines of John Contreni's recent and excellent book on the ninth-century cathedral school at Laon.<sup>104</sup> For Fleury alone, this task would be enormous. Some five hundred manuscripts (perhaps a conservative estimate) survive which were written at or were in the possession of Fleury before ca. 1100, and which are largely preserved in five libraries (Orléans, the Vatican, Bern, Leiden, and the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris). A tiny percentage of these has been adequately catalogued. Yet if one wishes to ask the question: what books might Oswald or Osgar have read during their sojourns at Fleury, it is too soon to expect an answer. Similarly, to the question, what books might Lantfred (who may possibly have come from Fleury) or Abbo have brought with them to England, and what books would they have taught, there is as yet no answer. Before these questions can be answered, the surviving books from Fleury will need to be catalogued and studied,<sup>105</sup> for without a knowledge of the tenth-century library at Fleury, it is impossible to understand the dynamics of late Anglo-Saxon literary culture.

The above point may be illustrated by a small example. Several years ago, while editing a curious poem<sup>106</sup> in hexameters - beginning *Flegmon, apoplexis, reuma, liturgia, spasmus*, continuing with ten more lines of similar Greek diseases, and ending with the admonition *tricocinare* ("sort it out for yourself!") - which is preserved in a mid-eleventh-century manuscript written at St. Augustine's Canterbury now in Cambridge (University Library, MS Gg. 5.35), a poem which is evidently confected from a glossary of Greek medical terms, I identified two surviving manuscripts of the glossary in question, and then raised the question as to whether one or other of them might be English.<sup>107</sup> I have subsequently studied the two manuscripts in question. Neither is English. One (and probably the other as well) is from Fleury. The one which is certainly from Fleury (Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reginensis Lat. 1260) contains, in addition to the medical glossary, a text of the *Cosmographia* of



Aethicus Ister. On the basis of several trial collations, I think it is very probable that this manuscript was the exemplar (possible via an intermediary) of another manuscript of Aethicus: Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS Scaligeranus 69 - a manuscript which, as T.A.M. Bishop demonstrated,<sup>108</sup> was written at St. Augustine's in the second half of the tenth century. And concerning the poem itself: I have subsequently found another copy of it in a manuscript which was written at Salzburg in the mid-ninth century but which was at Fleury in the late tenth century, when the poem was copied on to the last page of the manuscript, Orléans, bibl. munic. 184(161). The poem, then, is not, as I thought it was, an Anglo-Latin production, but was most probably composed at Fleury where the glossary which provided its vocabulary was found in one (and possibly another) copy. But if we ask the questions: how was it transmitted to Canterbury, and why was it copied into Gg.5.35, then it loses none of its interest for students of Anglo-Latin. It is one minor strand in the broadloom of influence between England and the continent in the tenth century.<sup>109</sup>

With these general remarks in mind, I shall proceed to discuss the three monastic houses of late Anglo-Saxon England which contributed most to Anglo-Latin literature: Christ Church, Canterbury; the Old Minster, Winchester; and Ramsey. For the study of Christ Church there are three primary texts which require scholarly attention. Frithegod's *Breuiloquium Vitae Wilfredi* (written 948×958) has been printed several times<sup>110</sup> but has not yet been adequately edited. The *Vita S. Dunstani* (written 995×1005) by the Englishman .B.<sup>111</sup> also needs to be edited anew with respect to the two surviving manuscripts as well as the slightly later abbreviation of it which was made for Abbo of Fleury. Above all, the collection of correspondence which was probably compiled at Christ Church during the decade 990×1000 and of which a copy survives in the first part of London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A.xv, needs careful study. Stubbs edited this collection over a hundred years ago,<sup>112</sup> but his edition (though indispensable) is not accurate, and badly needs redoing. When accurate editions of these three primary texts are available; when full account has been taken of T.A.M. Bishop's painstaking researches on Christ Church manuscripts;<sup>113</sup> and when Nicholas Brooks' forthcoming account of pre-Conquest Christ Church has been published,<sup>114</sup> we shall be in a stronger position to estimate the intellectual contribution of this monastery which, inasmuch as it housed Oda and Dunstan at various times, can never have been negligible.

A somewhat more favourable situation obtains with respect to the Old Minster at Winchester.<sup>115</sup> Here some of the essential texts are available for study in sound editions - notably, for example, Dom Thomas Symons' edition of Aethelwold's *Regularis Concordia*<sup>116</sup> - but many more, if they have been edited at all, are presently available only in partial or out-of-the-way editions; I would mention the *Translatio et Miracula S. Swithuni* of Lantfred,<sup>117</sup> or Aelfric's abbreviation of the *Regularis Concordia* which he made for his monks at Eynsham.<sup>118</sup> I hope that the situation at Winchester will be somewhat repaired - at least for texts relative to the cult of St. Swithun - by the imminent publication of *The Cult of St. Swithun*, which I have prepared as vol. IV, pt. 2 of *Winchester Studies* (under the general editorship of Martin Biddle.)<sup>119</sup> The volume contains new editions (with translation and full commentary) of Lantfred's *Translatio et Miracula S. Swithuni*, Wulfstan the Cantor's *Narratio Metrica de S. Swithuno* (a hexametrical version of Lantfred's text), an epitome of Lantfred's text which I would attribute to Aelfric, as well as a number of shorter, previously unpublished Latin poems on St. Swithun. Other texts, such as Aelfric's Eynsham customary mentioned above, or Wulfstan's *Vita S. Aethelwoldi*,<sup>120</sup> still require attention. Nevertheless, this textual work, when combined with the important work of scholars in ancillary disciplines - that of Helmut Gneuss and his pupils on the Winchester origins of standard Old English,<sup>121</sup> the Biddles' forthcoming account of their excavation of the Old Minster,<sup>122</sup> Robert Deshman's forthcoming study of the Benedictional of St. Aethelwold, and Alejandro Planchart's recent and excellent study of the Winchester trope repertory<sup>123</sup> - will soon allow a more comprehensive assessment of tenth-century Winchester than has hitherto been possible.

It is at Ramsey, however, where work in progress is most likely to effect a thorough-going reassessment of the picture which was current as recently as a decade ago. In 986, one of the most learned men in the Europe of his day, Abbo of Fleury, came at the invitation of Oswald and Dunstan to Ramsey, where he spent nearly two years instructing the English monks in a variety of subjects. The enormous impact of Abbo's teaching - in England as well as on the continent - has never been adequately appreciated; indeed, it is a pity that no satisfactory full-length study has ever been devoted to Abbo.<sup>124</sup> His influence on English learning is visible from several viewpoints: his polished *Passio S. Eadmundi*, which was immediately influential on



subsequent English hagiography;<sup>125</sup> his grammatical instruction, as purveyed by his so-called *Quaestiones Grammaticales*,<sup>126</sup> which were sent to the monks of Ramsey when Abbo had returned to Fleury; his computational learning as revealed in numerous surviving English manuscripts;<sup>127</sup> and his English student at Ramsey, Byrhtferth. Until recently, Byrhtferth was known solely as the author of a handbook to computational studies, partly in Latin, partly in Old English.<sup>128</sup> During the past decade, work by various scholars has greatly enlarged the canon of Byrhtferth's writings in Latin and Old English, to the point where he may eventually emerge as one of the most prolific authors of the late Anglo-Saxon period. To begin with, C. R. Hart demonstrated that the contents of a late eleventh-century manuscript in Oxford (St. John's College, MS 17), a vast compendium of computational materials, were intimately connected with similar materials in Byrhtferth's handbook (or *Enchiridion*, as Byrhtferth himself called it); Hart suggested that the St. John's manuscript was a copy of a (lost) manuscript assembled by Byrhtferth himself.<sup>129</sup> Peter Baker, in a forthcoming article, has demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt that the *Enchiridion* was in fact intended by Byrhtferth as a sort of commentary on materials which has been assembled in the lost exemplar of St. John's 17.<sup>130</sup> Now St. John's 17 is a fascinating manuscript, and deserves close attention (indeed, it ought to be published entire, preferably in facsimile). It contains an introduction (*epilogus*) by Byrhtferth,<sup>131</sup> a calendar, computational notes and diagrams by Abbo of Fleury, copies of Bede's *De Temporibus*, *De Temporum Ratione* and *De Natura Rerum*, Helperic's *Liber de Computo*, and a good deal of miscellaneous grammatical and medical material; there are marginal glosses throughout, many of which are demonstrably Byrhtferth's (and, as such, deserve publication). Even setting aside the computational materials (which are not to every scholar's taste), there is much in this manuscript to interest students of Anglo-Latinity. One item has particular interest. Against various dates in the above mentioned calendar (found on ff. 16-21) are some hexameters: the relicts of a metrical calendar. On closer inspection it is clear that the basis of this Ramsey calendar was the earlier metrical calendar which I mentioned in connection with York (which had been compiled there ca. 800, and which venerated many local York saints). In the Ramsey calendar, the York saints have been suppressed, and replaced with a number of northern Frankish saints, in particular, those venerated at and near Fleury; there are also several saints venerated

in late tenth-century England: St. Oswald of Worcester, St. Kenelm of Winchcombe, St. Edmund of East Anglia (whose *passio* was first composed by Abbo during his stay at Ramsey). I would be inclined to distinguish three phases in the development of this metrical calendar from Ramsey: (1) the original version written at York, ca. 800; (2) its transmission to northern Francia and eventually Fleury, where the local English saints were expunged and replaced with Frankish ones; and (3) transmission once again to England - possibly through the agency of Abbo himself - where local English saints were once again added, this time those who were currently being venerated at Ramsey. At this remove the authorship of the Ramsey calendar cannot be determined, but it is natural to think of one (or more) of the literary figures who were active at Ramsey in the late tenth century: Abbo, Byrhtferth, or Oswald the Younger. In any case, the Ramsey calendar, when printed, will provide one more link between England and the continent in the tenth century, and one more specimen of Anglo-Latin verse.<sup>132</sup>

While Hart and Baker have been working with Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion*, I have been studying his Latin style. As I hope to have demonstrated, Byrhtferth writes Latin in an absolutely unmistakable way, and the imprint of his authorship can be recognized wherever it occurs. Recognition of this unmistakable style has led me to attribute to Byrhtferth three substantial Latin works: the *Vita S. Oswaldi* and the *Vita S. Ecgwini* (both preserved side by side in London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero E.i, vol. 1<sup>133</sup>), and, more recently, the early sections (five in number) of the *Historia Regum* which passes under the name of Symeon of Durham.<sup>134</sup> The identification of Byrhtferth's authorship of these works is a strong argument in favour of their re-edition: I have prepared editions of the *Vita S. Oswaldi* and *Vita S. Ecgwini*, while David Dumville is at work on an edition of the *Historia Regum*. When these editions are available, the study of Byrhtferth's peculiar Latinity will be placed on a secure footing. But Byrhtferth commands attention in other respects. He was very proud of his quite remarkable learning, and found countless occasions to quote from books he had read. By studying Byrhtferth's Latin writings together with the *Enchiridion* and St. John's 17, we will be able to form an accurate estimate of the contents of the library at Ramsey in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries - a fact which assumes the greater significance in that very few surviving books are known to have been written at Ramsey, and no recognizable script has yet been



associated with it (Ramsey does not figure at all in T.A.M. Bishop's *English Caroline Minuscule*). Like most Anglo-Saxon scholars, Byrhtferth was able to quote from a wide range of late Latin and Christian Latin poets (notably the *Disticha Catonis*, Prosper, Prudentius, Caelius Sedulius, and Arator). He knew Aldhelm apparently by heart.<sup>135</sup> He seems to have possessed a fairly complete set of Bede's historical writings (it may even be possible to identify the manuscript of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* from which he quotes<sup>136</sup>), and his lengthy citations of Bede's poem *De Die Iudicii* are of cardinal importance in understanding the textual transmission of that work.<sup>137</sup> Equally significant is Byrhtferth's familiarity with philosophical texts. He quotes from Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, particularly the *metra*, at many points.<sup>138</sup> He appears to have been the first Englishman to know Macrobius' commentary *In Somnium Scipionis*, and there is some evidence to suggest that it was Abbo who brought the work to England.<sup>139</sup> At any event, before any overall assessment of the Anglo-Saxon school curriculum can be made, the Latin writings of Byrhtferth will require scholarly attention.

I have concentrated on Christ Church (Canterbury), the Old Minster (Winchester), and Ramsey because it seems to me that intellectual life was most vigorous in these three monastic houses; to them, at least, we can attribute surviving Latin texts. There are numerous texts of primary importance which cannot easily be attributed to a particular centre. Three sorts of text may be signalled: Latin glossaries, colloquies, and saints' lives. For the early period (before 900), the principal Latin-Old English glossaries have been carefully edited - in large measure because they have attracted the attention of Old English philologists.<sup>140</sup> For the later period, there are numerous Latin-Latin glossaries and *glossae collectae* preserved in pre-Conquest Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, and these, by and large, have never been printed or studied.<sup>141</sup> Until they have all been printed, it is impossible to gain an adequate understanding of the sources of obscure or hermeneutic vocabulary which was employed by Anglo-Latin authors of the later period. The scholastic colloquy was a form frequently used by Anglo-Latin authors, both for elementary instruction and as a vehicle for the ostentation of learned vocabulary; although the most important Anglo-Latin colloquies have been printed,<sup>142</sup> their sources and diffusion are not yet properly understood.<sup>143</sup> There are also numerous anonymous saints' lives from the late Anglo-Saxon period which have been

neglected by students of Anglo-Saxon culture for the apparent reason that they are available only in unsatisfactory editions over a century old: I would mention the *Historia de S. Cuthberto*,<sup>144</sup> the *Vita S. Rummoldi*,<sup>145</sup> and the *Vita S. Neoti*.<sup>146</sup> Other examples of Anglo-Latin hagiography remain unpublished.

I began my discussion of tenth-century Anglo-Latin literature by pointing to pre-Conquest manuscripts as yet inadequately catalogued, and suggested that many unknown works will eventually come to light. Furthermore, the Anglo-Latin scholar cannot lazily accept 1066 as the terminus of his manuscript researches, for there is the very real possibility that works of the pre-Conquest period are to be found in manuscripts copied a century or more after the Conquest. This point may be illustrated by one brief example. A manuscript in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, Digby 112, which was apparently written at Winchester in the very early twelfth century, contains several works of interest to the Anglo-Latin scholar: an unprinted *vita* of St. Birinus, the apostle of Wessex, which could prove on examination to have been written at about the time of the Conquest,<sup>147</sup> an unprinted Latin translation of a lost Old English *vita* of the Irish martyr St. Indract who was venerated at Glastonbury,<sup>148</sup> and a recension of a *vita* of St. Ecgwine of Evesham composed not long after the Conquest.<sup>149</sup> Perhaps the most fascinating text in the manuscript is a Latin translation of a (lost) Greek work describing the churches and shrines of eleventh-century Constantinople. The recent editor of the Latin text, Krijnie Ciggaar,<sup>150</sup> has demonstrated that the translation was made in England at the time of the Conquest or very soon thereafter; it thus provides an important witness to the study of Greek in Anglo-Saxon England and another link in the chain of Anglo-Byzantine relations which have exercised historians of the period.<sup>151</sup> Digby 112 is a small manuscript, but its treasures are great; other post-Conquest manuscripts may hold similar treasures. No doubt a law of diminishing returns will operate as the quest for pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin writings is extended later and later into medieval manuscripts; but it cannot therefore be abandoned. And, finally, one ought as a matter of habit to become familiar with the writings of the sixteenth-century antiquaries:<sup>152</sup> they had access to the manuscript holdings of English monasteries before the Dissolution, and consequently may have seen and recorded details of manuscripts which have subsequently been lost or destroyed. John Leland in particular had an inimitable knowledge of manuscripts



in monastic libraries, and the four crammed volumes of transcriptions in his own hand, called the *Collectanea*,<sup>153</sup> are richly deserving of study and frequently yield Anglo-Latin texts which have previously been unknown.<sup>154</sup> I never quite despair of one day finding, during a chance consultation of a manuscript, the lost works of Oswald the Younger of Ramsey, Byrhtferth's contemporary, whose writings Leland described so fully and praised so fulsomely.<sup>155</sup>

The task facing the Anglo-Latin scholar today is enormous, but not, perhaps, insuperable. We will increasingly have the benefit of a number of scholarly enterprises now in progress. Helmut Gneuss has undertaken the difficult but absolutely fundamental task of compiling a preliminary list of pre-Conquest manuscripts of English origin or provenance.<sup>156</sup> It is intended that the preliminary list will eventually be followed by a catalogue describing the contents of all the manuscripts in question; in the time between the publication of the preliminary list and the catalogue, scholars working actively in the field of Anglo-Latin studies must assume the responsibility of sending to Gneuss all pertinent information to Anglo-Saxon manuscripts with which they are familiar. In order that facsimile editions of the most important insular manuscripts may be made easily and inexpensively available, a Cambridge publisher has undertaken to publish facsimile volumes of manuscripts in microfiche. An initial series of some ten manuscripts in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, is being planned under the general editorship of Raymond Page. Another indispensable tool to research in this field is the British Academy's *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, of which one fascicle (A-B) appeared in 1975, with another (C) scheduled for publication in 1981. The first fascicle did not give the coverage one might have wished to pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin texts, particularly to the most obscure words which are found in these texts. But the new editor of the dictionary, David Howlett, is a scholar active in the field of Anglo-Latin<sup>157</sup> and well-versed in the problems which Anglo-Latin texts present. One can anticipate that future fascicles prepared under his direction will become increasingly useful for study of the pre-Conquest period. The publication of the *Toronto Old English Dictionary* will also be an indispensable tool, since so many words in the Old English lexicon are attested as glosses to words in Latin texts, and knowledge of the Old English equivalents will help in interpreting Latin lemmata, particularly the most difficult ones. Finally, it is essential for the

problems characteristic of Anglo-Latin studies to become better known. In this respect, the editors of *Toronto Medieval Latin Texts* have rendered a great service in publishing two fine editions of Anglo-Latin texts - Michael Winterbottom's edition of three tenth-century saints' lives, Colin Chase's of two collections of Alcuin letters assembled by Archbishop Wulfstan.<sup>158</sup> By using texts such as these, undergraduate and graduate students will become familiar with the problems and peculiarities of Anglo-Latin at an early stage of their work. If the subject is to progress and flourish, their active participation is essential.



## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>*Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1896; most recent reprinting 1969). The more recent edition of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* by B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford, 1969), takes account of the early Leningrad manuscript of Bede which Plummer had not seen and which affects a handful of readings in the text; but Colgrave's annotation is skeletal compared with Plummer's (on which it is largely based), and Mynors' account of the manuscript tradition, too, is based on Plummer - a debt which Mynors generously acknowledges. Furthermore, Plummer's volume includes editions of Bede's *Historia Abbatum* and the anonymous *Vita S. Ceolfridi*. There is a memoir of Plummer in the *Proceedings of the British Academy* 15 (1929): 463-76; and see the fine essay by J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, "Bede and Plummer," in *Famulus Christi*, ed. G. Bonner (London, 1976), pp. 366-85.

<sup>2</sup>*Asser's Life of King Alfred* (Oxford, 1904; rep. in 1959 with an additional essay by D. Whitelock, "Recent Work on Asser's Life of Alfred").

<sup>3</sup>A. S. Napier and W. H. Stevenson, *The Crawford Collection of Early Charters and Documents* (Oxford, 1895). Shortly before his death in 1924, Stevenson was working on the edition of a number of Anglo-Latin colloquia (see n. 142 below), which were published posthumously by W. M. Lindsay. Although the posthumous edition is a valuable one, it lacks the detailed annotation which Stevenson would no doubt have wished to give it.

<sup>4</sup>*The Corpus Glossary* (Cambridge, 1921); *The Corpus, Epinal, Erfurt and Leiden Glossaries* (Oxford, 1921). Lindsay also contributed the inspiration and an enormous amount of work to the *Glossaria Latina*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1926-31); although the glossaries printed in this edition are not Anglo-Latin, they are the bases of all later medieval Latin glossaries, and as such are fundamental to understanding the sources of the unpublished Latin-Latin glossaries of the pre-Conquest period (see n. 141 below).

<sup>5</sup>12 vols. and supplement (Oxford, 1934-71); a second edition of vol. 11 (Great Britain and Ireland) was published in 1972.

<sup>6</sup>M. L. W. Laistner and H. H. King, *Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1943).

<sup>7</sup>*Beda's Venerabilis Expositio Actuum Apostolorum et Retractio* (Cambridge, Mass., 1939; rep. 1970). Some of Laistner's most important essays are reprinted in his *The Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages*, ed. C. G. Starr (New York, 1972). Laistner's cursory treatment of certain Anglo-Latin authors in his *Thought and Letters in*

*Western Europe A.D. 500 to 900*, rev. ed. (Ithaca, N.Y., 1957) is in many ways the most reliable introduction in English to the early period of Anglo-Latin.

<sup>8</sup>*Beda's Opera de Temporibus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1943); the texts contained in this volume have recently been reprinted - without Jones' lavish introduction and commentary - as *Beda's Opera Didascalica* 2, CCSL 123B (Turnhout, 1977). Jones of course (unlike the other scholars I mention here) is alive and still actively publishing in the field of Anglo-Latin studies; but I feel that his name should be associated with the great scholars of the earlier period *honoris causa*. See now *Saints, Scholars and Heroes: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honour of Charles W. Jones*, ed. M. H. King and W. M. Stevens, 2 vols., (Collegeville, Minn., 1979).

<sup>9</sup>There is an excellent sketch of the development and achievements of the MGH project by Levison in Wattenbach-Levison, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter I: Vorzeit und Karolinger* (Weimar, 1952), pp. 17-28.

<sup>10</sup>Alcuin's poetry: in MGH, *Poetae Aevi Carolini Latini* 1 (Berlin, 1881): 160-351; Alcuin's letters: in MGH, *Epistolae* 4.2 (Berlin, 1895): 18-481.

<sup>11</sup>MGH, *Epistolae Selectae* 1: S. Bonifatii et Lullii *Epistolae*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1955).

<sup>12</sup>MGH, *Auctores Antiquissimi* 15 (Berlin, 1919).

<sup>13</sup>MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini* 4.3 (Berlin, 1896): pp. 903-10, 943-62, etc.

<sup>14</sup>MGH, *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum Scholarum: Vitae S. Bonifatii Archiepiscopi Moguntini* (Hannover/Leipzig, 1905, rep. 1977).

<sup>15</sup>(Oxford, 1946, rep. most recently in 1973). There is also much of interest to the student of Anglo-Latin in Levison's collected papers, *Aus Rheinischer und Fränkischer Frühzeit: Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, ed. W. Holtzmann (Düsseldorf, 1948); for a complete record of his writings, see Wilhelm Levison 1876-1947: *A Bibliography* (Oxford, 1948).

<sup>16</sup>*Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars* (New York, 1947); *Alcuin, Friend of Charlemagne* (New York, 1951); *St. Dunstan of Canterbury* (London, 1955), and *Alfred the Great and his England* (London, 1957).

<sup>17</sup>Colgrave's editions include: *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus* (Cambridge, 1927); *Two lives of St. Cuthbert* (Cambridge, 1940); *Felix's Life of St. Guthlac* (Cambridge, 1956); and *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1968). Perhaps the least dependable of these is the first, which should be not be consulted if a copy of Levison's edition of the *Vita S. Wilfridi* (in MGH, *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 6 (Hannover/Leipzig, 1913): 163-263) is at hand.

<sup>18</sup>Campbell's editions include: *Encomium Emmae Reginae*, Camden Third Series 72 (London, 1949); *Frithegod's Monachi Breviloquium Vitae Beati Wilfredi et Wulfstani Cantoris Narratio Metrica de S. Swithuno*, Thesaurus Mundi 1 (Zürich, 1950); *Chronicon Aethelweardi* (London, 1962); and *Aethelwulf De Abbatibus* (Oxford, 1967). The quality of these



editions varies considerably: that of the *Encomium Emmae* is sound and provided with ample and helpful commentary; on the other hand, that of Frithgod - admittedly a fiercely difficult text - provides abundant evidence that Campbell could not begin to understand the text he was editing.

<sup>19</sup>(Cambridge, Mass., 1967). Ogilvy's book will be used by every scholar in the field, often with gratitude, but it cannot be relied upon, particularly at places where Ogilvy cites manuscripts (he has evidently not consulted the manuscripts he cites and has not sought the advice of paleographers, with the result that his datings of manuscripts are often wildly inaccurate - some of those he cites as evidence for knowledge of a text in pre-Conquest England are as late as the fifteenth century - and their shelfmarks are often erroneously given).

<sup>20</sup>(Princeton, 1967). Bolton's attempt to provide a handbook for beginners and for scholars in ancillary disciplines (especially those working on Old English) is most commendable, and has the advantage of being provided with an ample, if indiscriminating, bibliography. The problem is that the book is not laid out in a way to help a beginner find the most reliable edition of a work and, amid the multifarious citations of occasional papers on Anglo-Latin authors by nineteenth-century country vicars, to find the most dependable discussions of that text; in other words, the bibliography needs to be more closely integrated with the discussion of each author, in the manner of Teuffel-Schwabe or Manitius. Furthermore, Bolton's book is infested with errors of every sort (especially errors of historical fact and of translation), and these are a serious drawback in a book intended for the non-specialist reader.

<sup>21</sup>I would draw attention to two other accounts of the state of research in Anglo-Latin: W. F. Bolton, "Pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin: Perspectives and Prospects," *Comparative Literature* 23 (1971): 151-66, and the brief but trenchant remarks by F. C. Robinson, "Anglo-Saxon Studies: Present State and Future Prospects," *Mediaevalia* 1 (1975): 62-77, who describes Anglo-Latin as "the real frontier in early English studies" (p. 72).

<sup>22</sup>There is some discussion of these problems by P. F. Jones, "The Gregorian Mission and English Education," *Speculum* 3 (1928): 335-48.

<sup>23</sup>"Who Introduced Charters into England? The Case for Augustine," *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 3 (1965-9): 526-42, rep. in *Prisca Munimenta*, ed. F. Ranger (London, 1973), 88-107; see also the earlier discussion by Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*, pp. 174-233.

<sup>24</sup>Hadrian is the addressee of Aldhelm's Letter II (ed. Ehwald, p. 478). There is an earlier study of A. S. Cook, "Hadrian of Africa, Italy and England," *Philological Quarterly* 2 (1923): 241-58. More recently, Professor Bischoff drew attention to the fact that Felix, the biographer of Julian of Toledo, mentioned among Julian's writings an *Epistola ad Adrianum Abbatem* (now lost), and this letter may conceivably have been addressed to Hadrian of Canterbury (see *Settimane di Studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 22 (1975): 299).

<sup>25</sup>Again, there is an earlier article by A. S. Cook, "Theodore of Tarsus and Gislenus of Athens," *Philological Quarterly* 2 (1923): 1-25, but this now requires complete revision.

<sup>26</sup>B. Bischoff, "Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter," *SE* 6 (1954), 189-281, rep. in Bischoff's *Mittelalterliche Studien*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1966-7), 1: 205-73. This seminal article has been translated into English by C. O'Grady in *Biblical Studies: The Medieval Irish Contribution*, ed. M. McNamara (Dublin, 1976).

<sup>27</sup>"Lapidary Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England: Part I, The Background; the Old English Lapidary," *ASE* (1978): 9-60, esp. 24 and 54.

<sup>28</sup>W. Bulst, "Eine anglo-lateinische Uebersetzung aus dem Griechischen um 700," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 75 (1938): 105-11.

<sup>29</sup>E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford, 1918): 137-51.

<sup>30</sup>At one point in his treatise *De Pedum Regulis* (part of his longer *Epistola ad Acircium*), Aldhelm quotes two lines of *Lucanus de Orfeo* (ed. Ehwald, p. 159). Lucan's poem *Orpheus* has not survived, and Aldhelm's quotation from it is one of the very few traces remaining (see W. Morel, *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (Leipzig, 1927), pp. 128-9). It is striking that the author of the *Liber Monstrorum* mentioned below also knew Lucan's *Orpheus* and referred to it on three occasions (see Morel, p. 129). Other Latin poets known to and quoted by Aldhelm such as Juvenal and Claudian were not otherwise known in Anglo-Saxon England for several centuries.

<sup>31</sup>Edition cited above, n. 12.

<sup>32</sup>Aldhelm: *The Prose Works* (Cambridge, 1979).

<sup>33</sup>"Aldhelm's Prose Style and Its Origins," *ASE* 6 (1977): 39-76.

<sup>34</sup>"Une liste de mots communs à Gildas et à Aldhelm," *EC* 15 (1978): 553-67.

<sup>35</sup>"Les sources du vocabulaire d'Aldhelm," *ALMA* 41 (1979): 75-90.

<sup>36</sup>Aldhelm: *The Prose Works*, pp. 16-18.

<sup>37</sup>F. Unterkircher, *Sancti Bonifatii Epistolae. Codex Vindobonensis 751 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Codices selecti phototypice impressi* 24 (Graz, 1971), p. 25.

<sup>38</sup>Ehwald, ed. pp. 477-8; Herren trans., Aldhelm: *The Prose Works*, p. 153.

<sup>39</sup>See C. W. Jones, *Beda's Pseudepigrapha* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1939), pp. 69-70.



<sup>40</sup>See E. Faral, "La queue de poisson des sirènes," *Romania* 74 (1953): 433-506, esp. 441-70, and L. G. Whitbread, "The *Liber Monstrorum* and *Beowulf*," *MS* 36 (1974): 434-71.

<sup>41</sup>F. Porsia, "Note per una riedizione ed una rilettura del *Liber Monstrorum*," *Annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, Università di Bari* 15 (1972), 317-38; C. Bologna, "La tradizione manoscritta del *Liber Monstrorum de diversis generibus*, Appunti per l'edizione critica," *Cultura Neolatina* 34 (1974), 337-46; L. G. Whitbread, "The *Liber Monstrorum* and *Beowulf*" (as cited in n. 40 above, and see the assessment of this article by Bologna in *Cultura Neolatina* 35 (1975), 366-9); F. Porsia (ed.), *Liber Monstrorum* (Bari, 1976); C. Bologna (ed.), *Liber Monstrorum de diversis generibus: Libro della mirabili difformità* (Milan, 1977); and A. Knock, "The *Liber Monstrorum*: An Unpublished Manuscript and Some Reconsiderations," *Scriptorium* 32 (1978): 19-28.

<sup>42</sup>In the *Liber de Natura Rerum* of the thirteenth-century Dominican Thomas of Cantimpré (ed. H. Boese (Berlin, 1973)), some thirty citations are attributed to the scholar "Adelmus" (a common medieval spelling of "Aldhelm"): of these, fourteen from Aldhelm's *Enigmata* and the other sixteen from the *Liber Monstrorum*. In other words, Thomas of Cantimpré was using a manuscript in which the *Liber Monstrorum* was attributed to Aldhelm, though no surviving manuscripts of the work bear such an attribution.

<sup>43</sup>I have treated the question at greater length in "Beowulf, Aldhelm, the *Liber Monstrorum* and Wessex," *SM* 3rd ser. 22 (1981): forthcoming.

<sup>44</sup>In *Bede: His Life, Times and Writings*, ed. A. H. Thompson (Oxford, 1935), pp. 237-66, and rep. in *The Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages* (as cited in n. 7), pp. 117-49.

<sup>45</sup>M. Manitius, "Zu Aldhelm und Baeda," *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien* 112 (1886): 535-634, at 581.

<sup>46</sup>See my remarks in the appendix to R. W. Hunt's "Manuscript Evidence for Knowledge of the Poems of Venantius Fortunatus in Anglo-Saxon England," *ASE* 8 (1979): 288-9.

<sup>47</sup>See the recent study by G. Philippart, *Les légendiers latins et autres manuscrits hagiographiques*, *Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental* 24-25 (Turnhout, 1977).

<sup>48</sup>One very important desideratum for Anglo-Saxon studies is an analysis of the contents and composition (and relationship) of the two massive passionals which survive from late Anglo-Saxon England: the one preserved in three manuscripts (London, British Library, *MS Cotton Nero E.1*, vol. 1, ff. 55-208 + *Nero E.1*, vol. 2 + Cambridge, *Corpus Christi College*, *MS* 9, pp. 61-458), the other in three manuscripts in Oxford (Bodleian Library, *MSS* Fell 1, 3, and 4).

<sup>49</sup>"Blickling Homily XIV and the Old English Martyrology on John the Baptist," *Anglia* 93 (1975): 145-60; "Two Saints in the Old English Martyrology," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 78 (1977): 101-7; "Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis: An Anonymous Sermon on All Saints

and its Use in Old English Prose," *Traditio* 33 (1977): 101-35; "Mary Magdalen in the Old English Martyrology: The Earliest Extant 'Narrat Josephus' Variant of her Legend," *Speculum* 53 (1978): 16-25; and "Popes of Rome in the Old English Martyrology," *Arca: Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs* 3 (Liverpool, 1979): 191-211.

<sup>50</sup>"Identifiable Books from the Pre-Conquest Library of Malmesbury Abbey," *ASE* 10 (1981).

<sup>51</sup>As cited in n. 11, above.

<sup>52</sup>E. g., E. Kylie, *The English Correspondence of St. Boniface* (London, 1911); E. Emerton, *The Letters of St. Boniface* (New York, 1940); and the German translation of Tangl, made accessible by R. Rau, *Briefe des Bonifatius, Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters* 4 (Darmstadt, 1968).

<sup>53</sup>"The Letter from Bishop Wealdhere of London to Archbishop Brihtwold of Canterbury: the Earliest Original 'Letter Close' Extant in the West," in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries: Essays Presented to N. R. Ker*, ed. M. B. Parkes and A. G. Watson (London, 1978), pp. 3-23.

<sup>54</sup>"An Unpublished Seventh-or Eighth-Century Anglo-Latin Letter in Boulogne-sur-Mer *MS* 74 (82)," *MAe* 48 (1979): 1-22.

<sup>55</sup>The line "internusque dies atque inmutabile tempus" in Boniface's *Enigma X* (ed. F. Glorie, *Collectiones Aenigmatum Merovingicae Aetatis*, 2 vols., CCSL 133-133A [Turnhout, 1968], I, p. 307) is repeated nearly verbatim from the *Carmen ad Flavium Felicem de Resurrectione Martuorum*, 195 (ed. J. H. Waszink, *Florilegium Patristicum, Supplementum* 1 [Bonn, 1937]: 82).

<sup>56</sup>Hygeburg's *Vita Willibaldi Episcopi Eichstetensis et Vita Wynnebaldis Abbatis Heidenheimensis* is edited anonymously by O. Holder-Egger, in *MGH, Scriptores* 15.1 (Hannover, 1887): 80-117; the identification of the authoress from a cypher at the end of the work was first made by B. Bischoff, "Wer ist die Nonne von Heidenheim?," *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens* 49 (1931): 387-8.

<sup>57</sup>*Hugeburc von Heidenheim, Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung* 12 (Munich, 1973).

<sup>58</sup>The *Ars Grammatica* by Tatwine, the Mercian scholar from Breedon-on-the-Hill, Leicestershire, who became archbishop of Canterbury (731-734), has been edited by M. de Marco, in *Tatvinus: Opera Omnia*, CCSL 133 (Turnhout, 1968), pp. 1-141; see the addenda and corrigenda to this edition by B. Löfstedt, "Zu Tatwines Grammatik," *Acta Philologica Fennica* n.s. 7 (1972): 47-65, and *idem*, "Weitere Bemerkungen zu Tatwines Grammatik," *Acta Classica: Proceedings of the Classical Association of South Africa* 15 (1972): 85-94. Vivien Law has demonstrated that certain glosses in manuscripts of Tatwine's *ars* were probably added by Tatwine himself: "The Latin and Old English Glosses in the *Ars Tatwini*," *ASE* 6 (1977): 77-89; on the textual transmission of Tatwine and Boniface, see her study "The Transmission of the *Ars Bonifacii* and the *Ars Tatuini*," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 9 (1979): 281-8.



<sup>59</sup>Boniface's *ars* was last edited in 1835 by Cardinal Mai. Work towards a new edition was undertaken by G. J. Gebauer, "Prologomena to the *Ars Grammatica Bonifatii*" (diss. Chicago, 1940), but Gebauer's edition was never published. Since then, a fragment of the work - in a hand contemporary with Boniface's lifetime - has been discovered; see W. A. Eckhardt, "Das Kaufunger Fragment der Bonifatius-Grammatik," *Scriptorium* 23 (1969): 280-97. A new edition by B. Löffstedt (largely based on Gebauer's research) has recently appeared: *Bonifatii (Vynfreth) Ars Grammatica* CCSL 123B (Turnhout, 1980). M. B. Parkes has recently made a convincing case for identifying the handwriting of Boniface in a number of early Anglo-Saxon manuscripts: "The Handwriting of St. Boniface: A Reassessment of the Problems," *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 98 (1976): 161-79.

<sup>60</sup>*The Ars Bonifacii: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Commentary on the Sources* (diss. Cambridge, 1978). The earlier treatment of Boniface's sources by Gebauer (as cited in n. 59) is inadequate for the needs of modern scholarship. There is also a useful study of Boniface's reading (in writings besides the *ars*) by H. Schilling, "Die Handbibliothek des Bonifatius," *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* 4 (1961-3): 286-348.

<sup>61</sup>Aldhelm's two treatises on metre (or perhaps they are one), the *De Metris* and the *De Pedum Regulis*, are contained in his longer *Epistola ad Acircium* (ed. Ehwald, pp. 77-96 and 150-204, respectively). Bede's *De Arte Metrica* is edited by C. B. Kendall in *Bedae Venerabilis Opera 1: Opera Didascalica*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123A (Turnhout, 1975): pp. 59-171; see also the study by R. B. Palmer, "Bede as Textbook Writer: A Study of his *De Arte Metrica*," *Speculum* 34 (1959): 573-84. Boniface's metrical treatise *De Metris et Caesuris* was printed long ago by T. Gaisford, *Scriptores Latini Rei Metricae* (Oxford, 1837), pp. 557-85, from a Wolfenbüttel manuscript, and partially by A. Wilmanns in *Rheinisches Museum* 23 (1868): 403-4, from Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Palatinus latinus 1753 (Lorsch, s.viii/ix). A new edition of this work is printed by Löffstedt (as cited in n. 59).

<sup>62</sup>See my discussion in "Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse," *Comparative Literature* 31 (1979): 209-31.

<sup>63</sup>As part of a doctoral dissertation entitled *The Anglo-Latin Hexameter: Theory and Practice c. 600-c. 800* (Cambridge, 1981). My cursory remarks are based on his exhaustive statistical analyses, but final assessment must await the publication of his results.

<sup>64</sup>Ed. F. Glorie, *Collectiones Aenigmatum* (as cited in n. 55), 1: 209-71.

<sup>65</sup>The conventional view and the evidence is put by Bolton, *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature*, pp. 219-23.

<sup>66</sup>There is perhaps some possibility that Bede composed *enigmata* which have not survived; see my remarks in *EHR* 90 (1975): 803.

<sup>67</sup>Especially the Lindisfarne Gospels (*Evangeliorum Quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis*, ed. T. D. Kendrick, T. J. Brown, et al., 2 vols. (Olsen/Lausanne, 1956-60)), the Book of Durrow (*Evangeliorum Quattuor Codex Durmachensis*, ed. A. A. Luce, G. O. Simms, et al., 2 vols. (Olsen/Lausanne, 1960)), and the Book of Kells (*Evangeliorum Quattuor Codex Cenannensis*, ed. E. H. Alton and P. Meyer, 3 vols. (Bern, 1950-1)). A facsimile edition of Durham A. II. 17 by T. J. Brown and C. D. Verey for the series *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile* is in press; this series also contains as vol. 2 *The Leningrad Bede*, ed. O. Arngart (Copenhagen, 1952) and vol. 9 *The Moore Bede*, ed. P. Hunter Blair and R. A. B. Mynors (Copenhagen, 1959).

<sup>68</sup>See n. 17 above.

<sup>69</sup>Cf. the remarks by P. Meyvaert in *Famulus Christi* (as cited in n. 72 below), p. 63, n. 19.

<sup>70</sup>In *Genesim*, CCSL 118A (Turnhout, 1967); *Opera Didascalica* 1, CCSL 123A (Turnhout, 1975); and *Opera Didascalica* 2, CCSL 123B (Turnhout, 1977).

<sup>71</sup>See B. Bischoff, "Zur kritik der Heerwagenschen Ausgabe von Bedas Werken," *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens* 51 (1933), 171-6; rep. in his *Mittelalterliche Studien* 1: 112-7.

<sup>72</sup>*Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede*, ed. G. Bonner (London, 1976). As far as I can see, the essays by Lucas, Ni Catháin, Kirby, Benediktz, and Harrison have little, if anything to do with Bede; on the other hand, the volume contains two outstanding essays: "Bede the Scholar" by Paul Meyvaert (pp. 40-69), and "Bede's Place in Medieval Schools," by C. W. Jones (pp. 261-85).

<sup>73</sup>See n. 10 above. Dümmler's edition is based on that of Wattenbach, which in turn was based ultimately on Gale's *editio princeps*. Dümmler's merit lies in having assembled the corpus of Alcuin's poetry from various sources and having furnished it with a scholarly apparatus.

<sup>74</sup>P. J. Godman, "Mabillon, Ruinart, Gale et L'Eboracum d'Alcuin," *Revue Mabillon* 59 (1978): 1-7; and *idem*, "The Tradition of Alcuin's Poem on York," *MJ* 15 (1980): 33-50. Godman has edited the York poem as part of a doctoral dissertation entitled *Alcuin's Poem on York and the Literature of his Times*, 2 vols. (diss. Cambridge, 1980).

<sup>75</sup>To cite one example: the *Officia per Ferias* (PL 101: 509-612) are certainly not by Alcuin; see A. Wilmart "Le manuel de prière de Saint Jean Gualbert," *RB* 48 (1936): 259-99, at 236, n. 2.

<sup>76</sup>Some aspects of Alcuin's literary estate have received an inordinate amount of attention. For example, advocacy for Alcuin as the author of the *Libri Carolini* has frequently been reiterated by L. Wallach (most recently in his book *Diplomatic Studies in Latin and Greek Documents from the Carolingian Age* [Ithaca, N.Y., 1977]), even though the persuasive arguments in favour of Theodulf's authorship put by A. Freeman in a number of studies (in *Speculum* 32 [1957]: 663-705, 40 [1965]: 203-89 and 46 [1971]: 597-612) appear to be incontestable and



have been accepted by a majority of scholars; see the balanced assessment by P. Meyvaert, "The Authorship of the *Libri Carolini*: Observations Prompted by a Recent Book," *RB* 89 (1979), 29-57. On the other hand, a good deal of effort has been expended in denying Alcuin's authorship of a poem ("O mea cella": no. 23 in Dümmler's edition) which is unmistakably his, for example, by M. L. Uhlfelder, "Classicism and Christianity: a Poetic Synthesis," *Latomus* 34 (1975): 224-31; see now P. J. Godman, "Alcuin's Verses O Mea Cella," *SM* 3rd ser. 20 (1979): 555-83.

<sup>77</sup>The vita is printed in J. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti*, 9 vols. (Paris, 1668-1701), 2:565-71; on Alcuin's possible authorship, see J. Trier, *Der heilige Jodocus*, Germanistische Abhandlungen 56 (Breslau, 1924), pp. 15-16 and 35-42.

<sup>78</sup>See R. Constantinescu, "Alcuin et les 'Libelli Precum' de l'époque carolingienne," *Revue d'histoire de la spiritualité* 50 (1974): 17-56. Professor Bullough has recently discovered another early manuscript of the Bamberg florilegium in the Escorial (MS B.iv.17) and is currently preparing an edition of this important work.

<sup>79</sup>See G. Ellard, *Master Alcuin, Liturgist* (Chicago, 1956), together with the important review by C. Hohler in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 8 (1957): 222-6. More recent studies include: O. Heimig, "Aus der Werkstatt Alkuins," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 4 (1956): 341-57; C. Vogel, "La réforme liturgique sous Charlemagne," in *Karl der Grosse*, ed. W. Braunfels, B. Bischoff, et al., 4 vols. (Düsseldorf, 1965). 2 (*Das geistige Leben*): 217-32; H. Barré and J. Deshusses, "A la recherche du missel d'Alcuin," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 82 (1968): 3-44; and K. Gamber, "Der frankische Anhang zum Gregorianum im Licht eines Fragments aus dem Anfang des 9. Jh.," *SE* 21 (1972-3): 267-89.

<sup>80</sup>W. Heil, "Der Adoptianismus, Alkuin und Spanien," in *Karl der Grosse*, 2: 95-155; and *idem*, *Alkuinstudien 1: Zur Chronologie und Bedeutung des Adoptianismustreites* (Düsseldorf, 1970).

<sup>81</sup>See E. K. Rand, "A Preliminary Study of Alcuin's Bible," *Harvard Theological Review* 24 (1931): 323-9; F. L. Ganshof, "La révision de la Bible par Alcuin," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 9 (1947): 7-20; and the important work by Bonifatius Fischer: *Die Alkuin-Bibel* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1957); "Bibeltext und Bibelreform unter Karl dem Grossen," in *Karl der Grosse*, 2: 156-216; and "Die Alkuin-Bibeln" in his *Die Bibel von Moutier-Grandval*, *BL Addit*, MS 10456 (Bern, 1972), pp. 49-98.

<sup>82</sup>In the meantime, the most satisfactory general account is still that by C. J. B. Gaskoin, *Alcuin: His Life and Work* (Cambridge, 1904). An important reassessment of Alcuin was presented by Professor Bullough in his Ford Lectures (delivered to the University of Oxford in Hilary Term, 1980); the publication of these lectures is imminent.

<sup>83</sup>I hope to return to the question of Northumbrian culture after Alcuin's departure on another occasion.

<sup>84</sup>A. Wilmart, "Un témoin anglo-saxon du calendrier métrique d'York," *RB* 46 (1934): 41-69.

<sup>85</sup>For Strecker's edition of the poem, see above n. 13, as well as Strecker's "Zu den Quellen für das Leben des Heiligen Ninian," *Neues*

*Archiv* 43 (1920-2): 1-26, and Levison's article, "An Eighth-Century Poem on St. Ninian," *Antiquity* 14 (1940): 280-91. The poem has been translated by W. W. MacQueen, "Miracula Nynie Episcopi," *Transactions of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, 4th ser. 38 (1959-60): 21-57.

<sup>86</sup>As Alcuin reports in a letter to the familia of Whithorn, ed. MGH, *Epistolae* 4, p. 431.

<sup>87</sup>It is commonly believed that the poem was written at Whithorn in Galloway, and subsequently transmitted to Alcuin via York (St. Ninian was the founder of Whithorn, and the poem speaks of Whithorn as *finibus nostris*). However, the poem is a hexametrical version of a (lost) vita of St. Ninian, which was most certainly composed at Whithorn; it is possible that the anonymous poet was merely following verbatim the wording of the prose vita in speaking of Whithorn as *finibus...nostris*. Furthermore, the poem is drawn from a wide range of Christian Latin poets, which implies a library of some considerable size. We know from Alcuin's poem on York that such a library existed at York, but of one at Whithorn we know nothing. I suspect, therefore, that the poem was composed at York by Alcuin's former pupils, and sent on to him (for the correction it so badly needs?) as proof that studies had not lapsed since the master's departure.

<sup>88</sup>Ed. A. Campbell (Oxford, 1967); see also the remarks by D. R. Howlett, "The Provenance, Date and Structure of *De Abbatibus*," *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 5th ser. 3 (1975): 121-30.

<sup>89</sup>Ed. T. Arnold, *Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia*, 2 vols. Rolls Series (London, 1885), 2: 31-66 (with interpolations which need to be discounted); on these "York Annals" see P. Hunter Blair, "Some Observations on the *Historia Regum* Attributed to Symeon of Durham," in *Celt and Saxon*, ed. N. K. Chadwick (Cambridge, 1964), pp. 63-118, esp. pp. 86-99, as well as my arguments for the attribution of the early sections of the *Historia Regum* (which incorporate the "York Annals") to Byrhtferth of Ramsey (as cited in n. 134 below). William Stubbs, I believe, was the first to suggest a connection between these "York Annals" and Alcuin (*Chronicon Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene*, 4 vols., Rolls Series (London, 1868-71), 1: x-xi.)

<sup>90</sup>In the middle of the ninth century (ca. 849) Lupus of Ferrières could write to Abbot Aldsig of York, asking for copies of Jerome, Bede and Quintilian to be sent to him (MGH, *Epistolae* 6, p. 62). York fell and the Vikings in 866 and thereafter the record is silent. If anything to the Vikings in 866 and thereafter the record is silent. If anything further is to be learned of the last days of Northumbrian culture, it will be from the painstaking analysis of the very few surviving ninth-century Northumbrian manuscripts, such as Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 63.

<sup>91</sup>See the general remarks of F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd edn. (Oxford, 1971), pp. 270-1.

<sup>92</sup>A few writings in Old English, such as the poetry of Cynewulf and the *Old English Martyrology*, have been attributed to ninth-century Mercia.



102. Because so much work remains to be done on this later period of Anglo-Latin literature, one might express the hope - without wishing in

111 Ed. W. Stubbs, *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, Rolls Series (London, 1874). pp. 3-52. On the nationality of B., see my remarks in *ASJ* 4 (1975): 81, n.2.



<sup>112</sup>Ed. Stubbs, *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, pp. 359-77, 380-90 and 396-404. C. Hohler has described this collection of correspondence as "the one major monument of scholarship from the period" (in *Tenth-Century Studies* [as cited in n. 155], p. 74).

<sup>113</sup>"Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts, Part VII: The Early Minuscule of Christ Church, Canterbury," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 3.5 (1963): 413-23, and *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford, 1971), *passim*.

<sup>114</sup>*The Early History of Christ Church, Canterbury*, forthcoming in the series *Studies in the Early History of Britain* (Leicester U. P.)

<sup>115</sup>On Winchester see now *Tenth-Century Studies*, ed. D. Parsons (Chichester, 1975), and in particular the studies by K. Symons, C. Hohler, M. Biddle, and J. J. G. Alexander. There is also an important recent study by D. J. Sheerin, "The Dedication of the Old Minster, Winchester, in 980," *RB* 88 (1978): 261-73.

<sup>116</sup>Ed. T. Symons, *Regularis Concordia* (London, 1953).

<sup>117</sup>This, perhaps the most important of the Winchester texts, must now be read by combining the text printed by E. P. Sauvage in *AB* 4 (1885): 367-410, with that printed earlier by Jean Pien in the *Acta Sanctorum, Iulii*, vol. 1 (Antwerp, 1719), pp. 331-7 (which is reprinted in *PL* 155, cols. 65-80). But these editions are based on incomplete and inferior manuscripts, and do not allow an adequate appreciation of Lantfred's work.

<sup>118</sup>Aelfric referred to the work as *pauca de libro consuetudinum*; it is edited by M. Bateson in *Computus Rolls of the Obedientiaries of St. Swithun's Priory, Winchester*, ed. G. W. Kitchin (Winchester, 1892), pp. 173-98. It remains to be determined how exactly Aelfric's work is related to Aethelwold's *Regularis Concordia*, and how deeply it is indebted *inter alia* to the *Liber Officialis* of Amalarius of Metz; cf. the remarks of M. McC. Gatch in *ASE* 6 (1977): 240-1 and those of J. R. Hall, "Some Liturgical Notes on Aelfric's Letter to the Monks at Eynsham," *Downside Review* 93 (1975): 297-303.

<sup>119</sup>M. Lapidge, *The Cult of St. Swithun*, Winchester Studies 4.2 (Oxford, forthcoming).

<sup>120</sup>There is a useful edition of this work by Michael Winterbottom (as cited in n. 158 below). However, the editorial principles of the series in which it appears (Toronto Medieval Latin Texts) require that the text be based primarily on one manuscript. Winterbottom chose London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius D.iv, vol. 2 with good reason, but even this text is deficient in places (e.g. at c.11.17, p. 41, where this MS omits the name of the Winchester monk Frithegar who is named in other manuscripts of the work). A critical edition based on all surviving manuscripts, together with a commentary illustrating the Winchester cult of St. Aethelwold, is a serious desideratum.

<sup>121</sup>H. Gneuss, "The Origin of Standard Old English and Aethelwold's School at Winchester," *ASE* 1 (1972): 63-83; see also the important studies by M. Gretsch, *Die Regula Sancti Benedicti in England und ihre altenglische Uebersetzung, Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen*

*Philologie* 2 (Munich, 1973), and "Aethelwold's Translation of the *Regula Sancti Benedicti* and its Latin Exemplar," *ASE* 3 (1974): 125-51.

<sup>122</sup>M. Biddle and B. Kjolbye-Biddle, *The Anglo-Saxon Minsters of Winchester*, Winchester Studies 4.1 (Oxford, forthcoming).

<sup>123</sup>A. E. Planchart, *The Repertory of Tropes at Winchester*, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1977).

<sup>124</sup>The monograph of P. Cousin, *Abbon de Fleury-sur-Loire* (Paris, 1954) is negligible; not much better is the discussion by C. E. Lutz, *School Masters of the Tenth Century* (Hamden, Conn., 1977), pp. 41-52. Far and away the most important study of Abbo is the brilliant essay by A. van der Vyver, "Les oeuvres inédites d'Abbon de Fleury," *RB* 47 (1935): 125-69.

<sup>125</sup>Ed. M. Winterbottom (as cited in n. 158 below), pp. 67-87. It is interesting to note that William of Malmesbury attributes to Aelfric an "abbreviatio Passionis S. Edmundi" (*Gesta Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, Rolls Series [London, 1870], pp. 406-7), but I have been unable to identify such a work of Aelfric in any of the very numerous manuscripts containing *passiones* of St. Edmund. In any case, Aelfric also produced an Old English life of St. Edmund (based, no doubt, on his lost *abbreviatio*) in his *Lives of Saints* (ca. 998), which indicates that Abbo's *Passio* had reached an audience outside of Ramsey within a decade of its composition.

<sup>126</sup>This work was first printed by Cardinal Mai, and then reprinted in *PL* 139, cols. 521-34; but this edition is so inaccurate as to be useless (cf. H. Bradley, "On the Text of Abbo of Fleury's *Quaestiones Grammaticales*," *PBA* 10 (1921-3): 173-80). A new edition has been prepared but not yet published: A. Guerreau-Jalabert, "Grammaire et culture profane à Fleury au Xe siècle: les *Quaestiones Grammaticales* d'Abbon de Fleury," *Ecole nationale des chartes, positions des thèses...* de 1975 (Paris, 1975), 95-101.

<sup>127</sup>See P. McGurk, "Computus *Helperici*: Its Transmission in England in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *MAe* 43 (1974): 1-5. Three of the manuscripts in question deserve detailed study: Paris, BN lat. 7299, (s. x/xi), Cambridge, Trinity College R.15.32 (945) (Winchester, s.xi<sup>1</sup>), and Oxford, St. John's College 17, on which see below.

<sup>128</sup>Ed. S. J. Crawford, *Byrhtferth's Manual*, Early English Text Society (London, 1929).

<sup>129</sup>"The Ramsey Computus," *EHR* 85 (1970): 29-44; and *idem*, "Byrhtferth and his *Manuel*," *MAe* 41 (1972): 95-109.

<sup>130</sup>P. S. Baker, "Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion* and the Computus in Oxford, St. John's College, MS 17," *ASE* 10 (1981), forthcoming. See also Baker's important study, "The Canon of Byrhtferth's Old English Writings," *Speculum* 55 (1980): 22-37, which is to some extent a refinement of some earlier suggestions by Peter Clemoes, "The Composition of the Old English Text," in *The Old English Illustrated Hexateuch*, ed. P. Clemoes and C. R. Dodwell, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 18 (Copenhagen, 1974), pp. 42-53.



- 131 See G. F. Forsey, "Byrhtferth's Preface," *Speculum* 3 (1928): 505-22.
- 132 It is edited in my "A Metrical Calendar from Ramsey," *RB*, forthcoming.
- 133 "Byrhtferth and the Vita S. Ecgwini," *MS* 41 (1979), 331-53.
- 134 "Byrhtferth of Ramsey and the Early Sections of the *Historia Regum* attributed to Symeon of Durham," *ASE* 10 (1981): forthcoming.
- 135 *Ibid.*
- 136 P. Hunter Blair observed ("Some Observations on the *Historia Regum*," as cited in n. 89 above, p. 91) that one of the extensive quotations from Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* in the *Historia Regum* contains a reading now found in only one surviving manuscript of Bede's work, London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius C.ii. It would be worthwhile examining this manuscript to see if it bears any indication of use by Byrhtferth.
- 137 See L. G. Whitbread, "After Bede: the Influence and Dissemination of his Doomsday Verses," *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 204 (1967): 250-66, esp. 252-5. Whitbread's remarks will need to be revised in light of my arguments that the early sections of the *Historia Regum* were compiled by Byrhtferth; likewise, Whitbread was unaware of the extensive quotations from *De Die Iudicii* in Byrhtferth's *Vita S. Ecgwini*.
- 138 Byrhtferth's extensive quotations of Boethius are an important witness to knowledge of the *De Consolatione Philosophiae* in late Anglo-Saxon England; another witness is the author of the poem *De Libero Arbitrio* which was composed at Winchester in the late tenth century (see *ASE* 1 (1972): 103-4). Numerous manuscripts of the *De Consolatione Philosophiae* survive which were written in England before the Conquest; some of these were provided with commentaries, which have been studied by D. K. Bolton, "The Study of the Consolation of Philosophy in Anglo-Saxon England," *Archives d'histoire doctrinales et littéraires du moyen âge* 44 (1977): 33-78.
- 139 Byrhtferth quotes the *In Somnium Scipionis* in his *Enchiridion* (ed. Crawford, p. 16) and again in the Prologue to his *Vita S. Oswaldi*. The earliest manuscripts of this work of Macrobius to arrive in Anglo-Saxon England appear to have some connection with Abbo of Fleury; for example, London, BL, MS Harley 2506, in which Van der Vyver believed he could identify the hand of Abbo himself, and the aforementioned manuscript in Paris, BN lat. 7299 (n. 127).
- 140 The principal editions are the following: J. H. Hessels, *An Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary preserved in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1890); *idem*, *A Late Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary preserved in the Library of the Leiden University* (Cambridge, 1906); W. M. Lindsay, *The Corpus Glossary* (Cambridge, 1921); R. T. Oliphant, *The Harley Latin-Old English Glossary* (the Hague, 1966); J. D. Pfeiffer, *Old English Glosses in the Epinal-Erfurt Glossary* (Oxford, 1974). There is also the older edition of T. Wright, rev. R. P. Wulcker, *Anglo-Saxon and Old English*

*vocabularies*, 2 vols. (London, 1884). Some of the glossaries in this last-mentioned work are badly in need of re-edition.

141 Latin-Latin glossaries in the following manuscripts may be mentioned: Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum 47; London, British Library, Additional 32246; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 163, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 356, pt. 3; London, British Library, MSS Royal 7.D.II and Harley 3826, as well as the English recensions of the *Hermeneumata Ps.-Dositheana* in Brussels, Bibl. Roy. 1828-30 and of the *Scholica Greacarum Glossarum* in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Barlow 35 and London, British Library, MS Royal 15.A.XVI. There are countless Anglo-Saxon manuscripts which contain batches of *glossae collectae*, and these too need attention. The task of editing these Latin-Latin glossaries is a formidable one and not to be undertaken lightly.

142 W. H. Stevenson, *Early Scholastic Colloquies* (Oxford, 1929).

143 There are two important studies: G. N. Garmonsway, "The Development of the Colloquy," in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. P. Clemoes (London, 1959), pp. 248-61; and M. Winterbottom, "On the *Hisperica Famina*," *Celtica* 8 (1967): 126-39.

144 Ed. T. Arnold, *Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia*, 2 vols. Rolls Series (London, 1882-5), 1: 196-214.

145 Ed. *Acta Sanctorum, Novembris*, vol. I, pp. 682-90.

146 Ed. J. Whitaker, *The Life of St. Neot, the Oldest of the Brothers of King Alfred* (London, 1809), pp. 339-65; cf. also G. C. Gorham, *The History and Antiquities of Eynesbury and St. Neots in Huntingdonshire and of St. Neots in Cornwall* (London, 1820), pp. 251, 261-3 and 266-70. It hardly needs stressing that a text which has been ignored for over 150 years is now deserving of attention.

147 *Vita S. Birini*: Digby 112, ff. 5v-17r; this vita is listed in the Bollandists' *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, 2 vols. (Brussels, 1898-1901), no 1361.

148 *Passio S. Indracti et sociorum eius*: Digby 112, ff. 99r-103r; listed in the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina* as no. 4271. I have discussed and edited this text in my study "The Cult of St. Indract at Glastonbury," in *Ireland in Early Medieval Europe: Studies in Memory of Kathleen Hughes*, ed. D. N. Dumville, R. McKitterick and D. Whitlock (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 179-212.

149 On this vita and on Digby 112 in general see my discussion "The Medieval Hagiography of St. Ecgwine," *Vale of Evesham Historical Society Research Papers* 6 (1977): 77-93, esp. 85-9; I have edited the text in "The Digby-Gotha Recension of the Life of St. Ecgwine," in *Vale of Evesham Historical Society Research Papers* 7 (1979), 39-55.

150 K. N. Ciggaar, "Une description de Constantinople traduite par un pèlerin anglais," *Revue des études byzantines* 34 (1976): 211-67.

151 See J. Shepard, "The English and Byzantium: A Study of their Role in the Byzantine Army in the Late Eleventh Century," *Traditio* 29 (1973): 53-92; C. E. Fell, "The Icelandic Saga of Edward the Confessor: Its Version of the Anglo-Saxon Emigration to Byzantium," *ASE* 3 (1974):



179-96; C. N. Ciggaar, "L'emigration anglaise à Byzance après 1066," *Revue des études byzantines* 32 (1974): 301-42; and for the earlier period, R. S. Lopez, "Le problème des relations Anglo-Byzantines du septième au dixième siècle," *Byzantion* 18 (1948): 139-62.

<sup>152</sup>In general, see T. D. Kendrick, *British Antiquity* (London, 1954).

<sup>153</sup>Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Top. gen. c.1-4; they are edited by T. Hearne, *Ioannis Lelandi Antiquarii De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea*, 2nd ed., 6 vols. (London, 1774). A new edition of Leland's *Collectanea*, identifying where possible the manuscripts from which he was copying and giving modern bibliography on each of the works in question, would be a very useful instrument of research. It is also worth noting that some detached fragments of Leland's *Collectanea* (not printed by Hearne) are preserved in London, BL Addit. MS 38132.

<sup>154</sup>For example, Leland transcribed a number of epigrams from an apparently lost manuscript which had once belonged to Milred bishop of Worcester (ob. 775); I printed these epigrams in "Some Remnants of Bede's Lost *Liber Epigrammatum*," *EHR* 90 (1975), 798-820. At approximately the same time a single bifolium from a lost manuscript written in Anglo-Saxon square minuscule and dating from the first half of the tenth century came into the possession of the University Library at Urbana Illinois. This bifolium was found to contain a number of epigrams, and these were edited by L. Wallach, "The Urbana Anglo-Saxon Sylloge of Latin Inscriptions," in *Poetry and Poetics from Ancient Greece to the Renaissance: Studies in Honour of James Hutton*, Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 38 (Ithaca, N.Y., 1975), pp. 134-51; see also the corrections and additions to this edition by D. Schaller, "Bemerkungen zur Inschriften-Sylloge von Urbana," *MJ* 12 (1977): 9-21. More recently, D. J. Sheerin has identified the hand of John Leland in the Urbana bifolium, thus raising the possibility that it is a fragment of the manuscript from which Leland copied the epigrams into his *Collectanea*: "John Leland and Milred of Worcester," *Manuscripta* 21 (1977): 172-80. But there are other treasures to be found in the *Collectanea*; see, for example, R. E. Buckalew, "Leland's Transcript of Aelfric's Glossary," *ASE* 7 (1978): 149-64.

<sup>155</sup>J. Leland, *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis*, ed. A. Hall, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1709), 1: 172: "...librum Sacrarum Precationum partim carmine, partim soluta oratione contexuit. Extat et eius de componendis epistolis opusculum, instar epistolae. Tantum memini reperisse me duos lucubrationum Oswoldi codices; unum Glessoburgi Somurotrigum [i.e. Glastonbury], alterum Ramesegae Fennicolarum [i.e. Ramsey]." All these works have apparently perished.

<sup>156</sup>"Manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Origin or Provenance: A Preliminary Hand-list," *ASE* 9 (1980): 1-60.

<sup>157</sup>See, for example, n. 88 above.

<sup>158</sup>M. Winterbottom, *Three Lives of English Saints*, Toronto Medieval Latin Texts 1 (Toronto, 1972); C. Chase, *Two Alcuin Letter-Books*, Toronto Medieval Latin Texts 5 (Toronto, 1975).

# SCIENTIFIC INSTRUCTION IN EARLY INSULAR SCHOOLS

Wesley M. Stevens

University of Winnipeg

The science to be discussed in this paper has to do with calculations and observations of both earth and skies. The evidence has not heretofore impressed modern philologists and historians who have searched for literary activities and their foundation in *grammatica* or who have scrutinized the patterns of prayer and psalms that one finds throughout European monasticism in the development of *cantica*. Yet the Celtic culture of striking images, fanciful word-plays, and astonishing holiness cannot be discussed very thoroughly without at least acknowledgment of a certain problem, like a thorn in the flesh: the date of Easter.<sup>1</sup> In Ireland, England, Spain, and Gaul during the entire seventh century, that problem demanded all available resources: resounding arguments ensued; traditions were born, defended, or undermined. Some scholars, like Bede, considered that the question had been resolved by A. D. 664; but later writers, like Abbo of Fleury, knew that it had not.<sup>2</sup> From the fragmentary materials surviving from arithmetical calculations, geometrical models of heaven and earth, and arguments about solar and lunar cycles it is possible to recognize in *computistica* not only occasional concerns but also concerted and significant scientific labours in the schools of the Scots of Ireland, Britons of Wales, Angles of Northumbria, Saxons of Southumbria and Wessex. If there were fanciful images they begin in *grammatica*; if there were prayers they were reinforced in *cantica*; but practical study of natural objects and the reckoning of relationships and motions of things were gathered together in *computistica*.<sup>3</sup> For science we look to the *computus*.

In the year A. D. 630 by our reckoning, a synod was held in Ireland at Campus Lenis (Magh Léna), and it was decided that beginning with the

*Insular Latin Studies*, ed. Michael Herren,  
Papers in Mediaeval Studies 1 (Toronto:  
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981)  
pp. 83-111



next year all should keep Easter with the universal church. It is not at all certain by what system this was to be achieved: whether it would be a simple table of dates; a sequence of memory verses; or a cycle of 8 or 19 or 76 or 84 or 95 or 112 years, with the *saltus* placed in the twelfth or the fourteenth or the sixteenth or the nineteenth year.

We know none of this. But we do know that there was serious objection to this decision and that someone brought about division among those who had agreed to celebrate Easter with the rest of the church. This objection seems to have led to a second synod a year later at Campus Albus (near Slieve Margy, Queen's County). According to the *Vita S. Munnu Siue Fintani* (d.636), the new *ordo Paschae* was defended there by Laisrén, abbot of Leighenne, under whom there were 1500 monks. But the old computus was defended by the holy Fintan, abbot of Tech Munnu (Taghmon, Co. Wexford), who kept the assembly waiting for a considerable time and finally made his entrance just before evening. Then he suggested how the Easter controversy could be settled:

There are three options, Laisrén:

- Two books could be put in the fire, the old and the new, so that we may see which of them survives the fire;
- or two monks, one of mine and one of yours, could be closed up in a hut and the hut could be set afire, and we should see which of them comes through the fire unhurt;
- or we could go to the tomb of a just monk who has died and bring him back to life, and he will tell us by which *ordo* we should celebrate Easter this year.<sup>4</sup>

Laisrén discretely refused the ordeal in any form on the grounds that Munnu's sanctity was so great that God would grant whatever he asked.

In the face of overwhelming holiness, Laisrén's decision was not an act of weakness, for the southern abbots were coming over to the new *ordo Paschalis*. Within only one century the northerners, British, and even the holy foundation of Columba on the island of Iona had abandoned the older computus "whose author or place or time we do not know," *cuius auctorem locum tempus incertum habemus* (as Cummián said), in favour of an Alexandrian series of Easters, which appeared to be a true reckoning universally observed.

Rather than rehearsing the Paschal controversies of the seventh century, I want to discover how it came about that sanctity yielded to science among the Irish and British as well as among the Saxons and Angles. Cummián will lead us:

Dominis sanctis et in Christo venerandis, Segieno  
abbati Columbae sancti et caeterorum sanctorum successorum,  
Beccanoque solitario, charo carne et spiritu fratri,<sup>5</sup>  
cum suis sapientibus; Cummiánus... (*Epistola Cummiáni*)

There are many Ségénes, Beccáns, and Cummiáns named in Irish annals and documents containing reports from the seventh century. This Ségéne was abbot of Iona (A. D. 623-652), and this Beccán was presumably a relative of the author of the letter. Beyond this letter our author is scarcely known; this Cummián must have been living in a region from which prominent abbeys would respond to his call for a synod at Mag Léna, a plain near Durrow.<sup>6</sup> They came from

- Emly (Co. Tipperary) where Ailbe had been bishop;
- Clonmacnois (Co. Offaly), founded by Ciarán;
- Birr (Co. Offaly), the place of Brendan;
- Mungret (Co. Limerick) where Nessan was known;
- Clonfert-Mulloe (Co. Laois) begun by Lugaid, that is, Mulloa;<sup>7</sup>

Cummián reports and comments on the controversy of new and old reckonings in which Laisrén avoided the ordeal proposed by that *paries dealbatus*, by which he presumably means Fintan (d. A. D. 635/6), successor to Munnu of Taghmon.<sup>8</sup> Against the ruler of the monks of Munnu, Cummián quoted St. Paul's response after the high priest Ananias had commanded him to be struck across the mouth: "God shall strike you, you white-washed wall..." (Acts 23.3), for Fintan pretended to observe the traditions of his elders and created discord from the unity which had been achieved at the previous synod of Mag Léna. "The Lord, I hope, will strike him down in whatever way he sees fit!" added Cummián, after Paul.<sup>9</sup> Against the discord of the old holy man, Cummián argues for Christian unity in celebrating the central feast of the year; and this unity was depicted in ancient terms as well as in terms of contemporary experience.

1. It makes no sense for Britons and Irish to observe an Easter in conflict with the four apostolic sees: Rome, Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria;<sup>10</sup>
2. It occurs that the whole world (Hebrews, Greeks, Scythians, and Egyptians) observes Easter at the same time, as found by a delegation sent to Rome in 631 whose Irish tables<sup>11</sup> gave them a date an entire month later than the others.

Are they all wicked, Cummián asked the holy Ségéne and the wise Beccán, or is it we who are on the outer edge of things? Are not the Britons and Irish in these matters but a pimple on the face of the earth?<sup>12</sup> Ségéne, like Fintan, was unmoved by appeals to Christian unity either in apostolic or universal terms. But Cummián was able to present also a series of detailed arguments based upon resources which, though lacking



an appeal to piety and apostolicity, nevertheless served those ends. He had studied the Easter cycles; for a whole year he had withheld judgment, sought out the explanations of different cycles, and analyzed what each race thought about the course of sun and moon. Could he really do this at the outer edge of the whole wide world? Here are the books which he names:

1. Primum illum quem sanctus Patricius papa noster tulit et facit; in quo luna a XIV. usque in XXI. regulariter, et aequinoctium a XII. kalend. Aprilis observatur.<sup>13</sup>

This was the usage of the ecclesiastical civitas of Milan, apparently following an Alexandrian table of the fourth century. Its limits for observing the Paschal moon were luna XIV-XXI, and luna XIV was the vernal equinox of XII Kal. Aprilis (=21 March) rather than XI Kal. Aprilis (=22 March) - accepting an adjustment to the Julian calendar which stemmed either from Alexandria or perhaps from the Council of Nicaea. The Easter festival would thus occur on the first Sunday after the first full moon after the vernal equinox. This was the system which Augustine must have learned from Ambrose. As the imperial government increasingly used Milan as a residence and seat of administrative government, the church there came to surpass other civitates in influence for northern Italy and Provence from the fourth to the eleventh century. The reckoning survived at some places in Gaul for several centuries, particularly at Auxerre, and it could have been learned by Patrick if he visited Gaul or Provence.

Cummian, however, also quoted from the acts of the Synod of Arles (assembled in A. D. 314 by Constantine to settle the disputed election of Caecilian as bishop of Carthage) concerning the need to celebrate Easter in common with the whole church:

Item Arelatensi synodo sexcentorum episcoporum confirmante primo in loco de observatione Paschae, ut uno die et uno tempore per totum orbem terrarum a nobis conservetur: ut universalis<sup>14</sup> Ecclesia uno ore, juxta apostolum, honorificet dominum unum.

The canons of the Synod of Arles survive in at least two versions, and there are also short and long versions of a letter from Bishop Marinus of Arles to newly elected Bishop Silvester of Rome, who had not been present. Conflation of these versions results in an initial canon which states:

Primo loco de observatione Paschae Domini, ut uno die et uno tempore per omnem orbem a nobis observatur [et iuxta consuetudinem literas ad omnes tu dirigas]...<sup>15</sup>

It would appear, therefore, that the Synod of Arles had given some thought to the diversity of Easter dates then practiced and had affirmed the need for unity and consistency. The evident interpolation to the above canon, as it appears in a manuscript of Marinus' letter, affirms that the bishop of Rome would fulfil this need through annual letters, but that expectation was not found in Cummian's source and was indeed misplaced. Doubtless some of them did prepare and circulate such letters in successive years within their area of influence,<sup>16</sup> but that area was most uncertain and their influence was insecure for good reason. At the time of the Synod of Arles, the Roman ecclesiastical civitas was using the older *Supputatio Romana* which had limits of luna XIV-XX, with Easter Sunday following equinox VIII Kal. Aprilis (=25 March). After A. D. 342 this was abandoned in favour of an 84-year cycle with lunar limits XVI-XXII. A further attempt to apply limits for the Sunday of Easter itself, as XI Kal. Aprilis - XI Kal. Maii (=22 March - 21 April), was introduced, and other adjustments suggest that the Romans may never have understood how to compute a date. Dependence upon regular correspondence with the bishop of Alexandria in addition to the tables was frustrating, as Leo (bishop of Rome, A. D. 444-461) pointed out in several letters. Thus the many changes of local usage by Roman bishops would not fulfil the intention of the Synod of Arles at all, and it is not surprising that Milanese usage and Roman variations came into conflict during the fifth century in Roman Africa, as will be discussed below.

Five British clergymen were reported to have been present at the Synod of Arles in A. D. 314: Eborius of York, Restitutius of London, Adelfius de civitate Coloniae Londinensium (perhaps Caalon on Usk), Sacerdos Presbyter, and Arminius Diaconus.<sup>16a</sup> What system for reckoning Easter this British delegation may have learned at Arles and taken home is, therefore, most uncertain, and all attempts to reconstruct tables on the basis of their attendance there have been contradictory.<sup>17</sup> However, the system attributed to Patrick<sup>17</sup> by Cummian<sup>17a</sup> was probably never used in Rome but was used in the Milanese civitas and its area of influence.

2. Secundo Anatolium, quem vos extollitis quidem ad veram Paschae rationem numquam pervenire eos qui cyclum LXXXIV. annorum observant.

The Pseudo-Anatolian Canon *Paschalis* also advocated the vernal equinox at the early Easter limit but took it to be VIII Kal. Aprilis (=25 March) of the earlier Julian calendar, even altering an authentic



paragraph from Anatolius of Laodicea for this purpose.<sup>18</sup> It held limits for the Paschal moon to be luna XIV-XX, and it strongly rejected the system associated with Patrick. The author may have been a Welsh Briton in the tradition of those British bishops at the Council of Arles in A. D. 314, and his reckoning must have been passed to the Irish long before A. D. 590, for these were the criteria which Columbanus knew at Bangor and which he promoted among the hostile bishops of Gaul.<sup>19</sup> Also apparently accepted at Lona, this Irish canon was an intelligent attack on a 19-year lunar table which was not being used properly, which seems to mean that the table was being applied with the Milanese or "Patrician" criteria of Luna XIV-XXI with equinox XII Kal. Aprilis. The canon further rejected an *amplior circulus*, deriving from certain African teachers, which not only advocated those limits but also required Easter Sunday to fall within XI Kal. Aprilis and XI Kal. Maii (=22 March - 21 April). This range was too broad when the equinox was observed on VIII Kal. Aprilis according to Pseudo-Anatolius. Thus the *Acta Synodi Caesareae*, which Cummián cited in the next item as "Theophilus," ought to be rejected, *detestandos ac succidendos esse*.

Both of the usages under attack were adjustments of lunar tables which had been generated to meet local needs elsewhere. The older *Supplicatio Romana*, with limits of luna XIV-XX and Easter Sunday following equinox VIII Kal. Aprilis, had been used in the Roman civitas only during A. D. 312-342. A later Roman attempt to set limits for Easter Sunday itself of XI Kal. Aprilis - XI Kal. Maii was cited by Hilarianus in A. D. 397 and was probably known to the Irish Pseudo-Anatolius indirectly through its adaptation to a special case in fifth-century Roman Africa. There the *Acta Synodi Caesareae* was produced in an attempt to reconcile divergent criteria, and this too was subject to a reaction in the *Computus Carthaginiensis* of A. D. 457. Either one could have struck our Irish author as the sophistry of certain Africans.

The *Canon Paschalis*, however, emphasized solar data, and this could have gained the respect shown it by later scholars, like Bede, even though they advised against following it. Although Pseudo-Anatolius rejected the system of Victorius of Aquitaine, he insisted that movements of the solar year could be accounted for only by use of an 84-year cycle.

### 3. Tertio Theophilum

This is probably a tract headed *Epistola Theophili*, which was a version of the *Acta Synodi* often quoted in Cummián's letter. It

repeatedly named a Theophilus, bishop of Caesarea, a metropolitan see said to have displaced Jerusalem in authority; and it affirmed that he presided over the synod by direction of Victor, *papa Romaneque urbis episcopus*. Nevertheless it does not appear to have derived either from Caesarea or from the Theophilus who had disputed Paschal questions with Victor, bishop of Rome (189-98). Nor was it from another Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria (385-412), who had indeed developed a Paschal table but not the one prefaced by this document. The first *Acta Synodi* may have originated in Roman Africa, from where it travelled and was modified in Spain, Celtic Britain, and Ireland. The situations from which each version arose have been accounted by C. W. Jones:<sup>20</sup> Augustine apparently had brought the lunar limits XIV-XXI from Milan to Carthage and Thagaste in A. D. 389/90 and thence to Hippo Regius where he became bishop, A. D. 395-430. These were the limits in use at Alexandria and Magna Graecia, including the bay of Naples and most of southern Italy; they were followed in Milan, northern Italy and parts of southern Gaul, but not in Rome. Churches of the Roman civitas and its sphere of influence were normally dependent upon annual correspondence between the bishop of Rome and the bishop of Alexandria. From time to time the Romans undertook to generate their own tables, though without much luck. The Romans also developed the custom of limiting the Sunday on which Easter would be celebrated to the period XI Kal. Aprilis - XI Kal. Maii (=22 March - 21 April) in order to avoid uproarious pagan festivities celebrating the founding of the city. Many cities in the Roman province of Africa accepted Roman guidance and, thus, the two kinds of Easter limits came into conflict there. The first version of the *Acta Synodi* appears to report speeches and discussion from a consultation and answers to a specifically localized problem in fifth century Africa; it may be authentic, and it certainly offers reconciliation. There is evidence that this settlement was rejected by a reassertion of "Roman" criteria in the *Computus Carthaginiensis* of A. D. 457.

The *Acta Synodi* travelled to Spain under the rubric *Epistola Philippi de Pascha* in some manuscripts, but there it was attributed to a Caesarean synod presided over by Theophilus. Sixth-century modifications include reference to certain churches in Gaul which celebrated Easter every year on the Julian equinox, VIII Kal. Aprilis (=25 March), according to an old Quartodeciman custom which was much berated by Cummián as well as by Pseudo-Anatolius. The same phenomenon was also



reported by the Spanish *Prologus* attributed to Cyril and by the *Tractatus de Ratione Paschae* attributed to Cyprian.

Variants of this Spanish version of the *Acta* were later complicated in the manuscripts by the introduction of sentences that were intended to emphasize conformity with Dionysian reckoning, which was also becoming known in Irish and Saxon schools during the seventh century. Such a variant was used by Bede in Northumbria by A. D. 725 in his *De Temporum Ratione Liber* (47: 87-94) in order to refute the *sententia vulgatum* that the crucifixion and resurrection had occurred on VIII Kal. and VI Kal. Aprilis (25 and 27 March), the same problem that plagued Spanish and Irish computists. There is no proper edition of any of these variant versions.

#### 4. Quarto Dionysium.

Dionysius Exiguus (ca. A. D. 470-550) was a Scythian scholar living in Rome when he was asked to prepare new Paschal tables, anticipating the expiration of a Latin version of Alexandrian tables with the year 531. He appears to have issued his 95-year continuation with the same incipit and with eight columns of data with headings similar to those of the Alexandrian usage.<sup>21</sup> However, he also introduced a new column for *anni Domini*, and he made the historical assumption that Jesus had been born on the first year of a 19-year cycle, corresponding to the consulship of C. Caesar and L. Paullus, which we call the year 1 B. C. This invited much criticism during successive centuries.<sup>22</sup> By the year A. D. 525, his tables had been given to Petronius of Africa as well as to officials of the Roman curia; the latter group affirmed to Johannes (bishop of Rome, A. D. 523-526) that the date of Easter could be determined and announced on this basis.<sup>23</sup> Despite the fact that Dionysius had shown, for the first time, how to reconcile Alexandrian Paschal limits of luna XV-XXI with the Roman custom that restricts Easter Sunday to the period XI Kal. Aprilis - XI Kal. Maii, there is no evidence that his tables were used in the Roman civitas by the time of Cumman, or of Bede, or even by the tenth century.<sup>24</sup> Cumman did not cite data from Dionysius' *Tabula Paschalis* or his nine authentic *Argumenta Paschalia*.<sup>25</sup> However, the terms used to describe his tenth source will demonstrate that he had at hand the *Praefatio* to those tables and both dedicatory letters.

#### 5. Quinto Cyrillum.

The *Epistola de Pascha*, which Cyril (bishop of Alexandria, A. D. 436-444) sent to the Council of Carthage concerning the Easter of A. D. 420, survives in thirteen computistical manuscripts, often along with materials related to Irish usage. This authentic letter was also available in the *Canones Ecclesiastici* 38, prepared by Dionysius Exiguus (PL 67: 145). However, the Latin version has been put to later use.<sup>26</sup> It seems to have been adapted at the behest of Boniface (bishop of Rome, A. D. 607) for the Roman mission in England, which may have been trying to use an 84-year cycle from either Rome or Gaul, or possibly even a Victorian cycle, but which had neglected the extra embolismic month - precisely the question to which Cyril had addressed himself. Boniface repeated Cyril with a slight adaptation to the year 607, repeated some of the queries he had received, then discussed various computistical matters in terms which provide indications of theories that are later than those of Cyril or Dionysius. It further appears that the elaborated version of this Cyril-Bonifatius letter was sent by Laurentius (bishop of Canterbury) to Celtic centres, both British and Irish. It was from the portions added to Cyril's early letter in Rome or in Canterbury that Cumman quoted.<sup>27</sup>

The *Epistola de Pascha* (or *Epistola Cyrilli*) is found together with Dionysian tables in extant computistical collections. It may be that they accompanied it from Rome to Canterbury, or from Canterbury to Celtic centres; but there is an absence of evidence that Dionysian usage had been accepted thus far either in Rome or in Canterbury.<sup>28</sup>

#### 6. Sexto Morinum.

*Disputatio Murini Episcopi Alexandrini de Ratione Paschali*.... survives in eight manuscripts. The first part introduced Victorian tables in the sixth century but is scarcely readable. The second part is intelligible and can be dated to either A. D. 604 or 632 by reference to the Victorian *saltus lunae*, but it favours Alexandrian and Dionysian usage against the Pseudo-Anatolian arguments. Thus attribution of the *Disputatio* to a bishop of Alexandria should be ignored, and at least the second part is probably of Irish origin from the early seventh century.<sup>29</sup>

All extant manuscripts are in Carolingian scripts which misread insular *r*, *s*, *n*, and *p*; thus the forms *Murinus*, *Morinus*, or *Morianus* could correspond to the two reported names of Irish computists from this



period: *Monino* and *Mosinu*. *Monino* Mocan was learned in the science of computus, according to Columbanus who had studied at Bangor before A. D. 590, and considered himself competent to challenge bishops of Gaul or Rome concerning Easter reckoning.<sup>30</sup> *Mosinu* maccu Min is said to have been a scribe and abbot of Bangor who "was the first of the Irish who learned by rote the computus from a certain learned Greek"; he is also named as Sillan, abbot of Bangor who died A. D. 610.<sup>41</sup> Palaeographically, the names *Monino* and *Mosinu* could be one and the same name. The computus which he memorized could also have been the memory verse which came to be attributed to Pachomius, allowing one to keep track of the lunar epacts in accordance with Alexandrian usage. This would have been an innovation at Bangor after Columbanus' departure.

#### 7. Septimo Augustinum (Agustinum MS).

Cummian named Augustine in three other places (along with Paul, Jerome, and Gregory) as an advocate against heresy and for unity, and he seems to be rather well-versed in Augustinian thought. Reference to Augustine as a source for computus offers several possibilities, however. The African bishop's best contribution to calendar problems was his long *Epistola ad Januarium*, which might have been known from Eugippius' *Excerpta ex Opera Augustini*. This work abbreviates the *Epistola*, with passages on the phases of the moon added from *De Genesi ad Litteram*.<sup>32</sup> Augustine had brought Alexandrian Paschal usage of Milan into Roman Africa, where it conflicted with local Roman custom as explained above. The reconciliation sought in the *Acta Synodi Caesareae* could have maintained his name in relation to collections of Spanish origin, which were further developed in Ireland as in the *sententiae Sancti Agustini et Isidori in Laude Compoti*.<sup>33</sup> While the surviving four parts of that accumulation have very little Augustine and much Isidore - the reverse of what one finds in Cummian's letter - its *capitulatio* enumerates fifty-six chapters of a computus no longer found in the fifteen extant manuscripts. Cummian's spelling of the name, *Agustinus*, could certainly be Spanish<sup>34</sup> and was retained by Irish scribes in various works.

#### 8. Octavo Victorium.

This Victorius was a teacher of arithmetic in Aquitaine during the fifth century and wrote a *Calculus* which served to instruct students in arithmetic without arithmology. In A. D. 455, the Alexandrian date of

Easter fell on VII Kal. Maii (=24 April) during Roman pagan celebrations and beyond the limits there preferred. Archdeacon Hilarus requested that Victorius study this problem, and he answered two years later with a letter accompanied by a *Cursus paschalis* based upon the 19-year lunar cycle of Alexandria which was known in Rome *de Graeco translata*. Victorius did not concern himself at all with avoiding the problems which had led to Roman discomfiture: an Easter later than 21 April and the need for celebrating the feast together with the other apostolic sees on the same date. Rather he pointed out discrepancies in basic assumptions about rules for calculating the first month (Nisan) and the limits for the Paschal moon, which were lunae XV-XXI for Alexandria but had become by the fifth century lunae XVI-XXII for Rome. In consequence, all tables for 84, 95, or 112 years were not in accordance with the others, were not cyclic for the other period, and should be set aside in favour of reckoning full moons (luna XIV) on the basis of the *annus Passionis*. This he found from the Eusebius-Jerome *Chronicle* as equivalent to the *annus mundi* 5229 (=A. D. 28). From this point he calculated Easters backwards to creation and forwards to his current A. P. 430 (=A. D. 457). At A. P. 532 (=A. D. 559) it appeared that his data began repeating themselves.<sup>35</sup>

Victorius' use of the *annus Passionis*, however, required him to apply the 19-year cycle out of phase with that of Alexandria, a problem accentuated by the *saltus lunae*. Although he provided alternate dates for *Latini* when reckonings for *Graeci* passed Roman limits, he attributed the *Graeci* Paschal limits to luna XXII, which they never observed. Furthermore, he did not take into account the change of vernal equinox from VIII to XII Kal. Aprilis, which added confusion to the application of his tables.

The Victorian cycle was used only once in Rome (probably by coincidence), but it became popular in Gaul. According to Columbanus, it had been tested and rejected in his part of Ireland before A. D. 590, but it appears to have been favoured still in the mid-seventh century by others. Cummian spoke well of Victorius, apparently in appreciation of his application of the Alexandrian 19-year cycle and of his rejection of the other kinds of Easter tables.<sup>36</sup>

#### 9. Nono Pacomium monachum, Aegypti coenobiorum fundatorem; cui ab angelo ratio Paschae dictata est.

Pachomius was a cenobite of Upper Egypt who lived ca. A. D. 290-347. His activities began about 320 at Tabennisi in the Thebaid, where he



linked cells of hermits into great colonies. The reference by Cummián is to nineteen verses, which may have been composed by a Visigoth in Spain (ca. A. D. 600) whence they soon came to be known in Ireland and Gaul: *Nonae Aprilis norunt quinos...*<sup>37</sup> They provide in memorable form the Julian date for the Paschal moon and the ferial regular for each year of the Alexandrian 19-year cycle in Latin usage. The ferial regular for each year is a number which indicates the difference between the weekday on IX Kal. Aprilis (=24 March) and the weekday on which the Paschal full moon occurs. To this one adds the concurrents and thus learns the weekday of the Easter limit, beyond which Easter does not occur in that year. The verses seem to have been known at Bangor about A. D. 605, and the *Epistola Cyrilli*, cited above, received an addition which could have had an insular source prior to the Easter problem of 607, and which reported angelic voices to Pachomius, pertaining *ut non errorem incurrerent in solemnitate paschalis ratione...*, on the basis of Gennadius' fifth-century account.<sup>38</sup> With these verses, the dates and epacts for nineteen years of an Alexandrian cycle could be remembered anywhere, anytime.

10. *Decimo trecentorum decem et octo episcoporum decennovenalem cyclum (qui Graece Enneacedeciterida dicitur) in quo kalendae Januarii lunaeque ejusdem diei et initia primi mensis ipsiusque XIV. lunae recto jure ac si quodam clarissimo tramite, ignorantiae relictis tenebris, studiosis quibusque cunctis temporibus sunt adnotae, quibus paschalis sollemnitas probabiliter inveniri potest.*

No Paschal table survives from the Council of Nicaea, though epistolary references to it suggest that there had been agreement on certain rules which are simple and memorable: Easter will be celebrated on the first Sunday after the first full moon after the vernal equinox, and that equinox was assumed to occur on XII Kal. Aprilis (=21 March). This became a tradition which attached itself to certain Easter tables, among them the Dionysian ones. In the preface to his tables, Dionysius had been satisfied to cite the *sancti patres* as the source for the Alexandrian tables, upon which his own were based; but in both his *Epistola ad Petronium* and his *Epistola ad Bonifatium et Bonum* he identified them with the 318 *venerabiles pontifices* or *sancti* at Nicaea accepting a tradition which had been developing for a century and a half.<sup>39</sup> Cummián cited *Nicensis synodus CCCXIII episcoporum*, and he also quoted one phrase, *decennovenalem qui Graece enneacedeciterida (dicitur)*, which could have been found either in the preface to Dionysius' *Tabula Paschalis* or in his *Epistola ad Petronium*. The second phrase, *ignorantiae*

*relictis tenebris, studiosis*, is from the *Epistola ad Bonifatium et Bonum*.<sup>40</sup> However, neither these writings nor the tables deriving from Dionysius offer data for the first and fourteenth moons of the first month (Nisan) or for the *kalendae Januarii lunaeque ejusdem diei*. Dionysius reckoned the age of the moon or the number of epacts on the Kalends of September, *sedes epactarum*, in keeping with Alexandrian usage; and he ignored the Kalends of January. Other tables generated under Roman influence, such as the *Laterculus* of Augustalis which ran for a hundred years (213-312) on the basis of an 84-year cycle, reckoned the age of the moon on the Kalends of January. Thus, it was probably not a Dionysian table to which Cummián referred.

The ten computistical items named by Cummián have very intricate histories of their own and are now found in a variety of versions that are really quite amazing. Each requires a critical edition which would show the efforts of many highly trained men to conceive of relations between sun and moon and earthly history such that the Christian festival could be celebrated everywhere and by everyone on the same date, year after year. But each attempt failed. Each attempt, nevertheless, survived and was adapted to new circumstances in new places. The calculations that these computations require are multiple but not very sophisticated in themselves, whereas their applications and their relationships are complex. Cummián assessed these complexities and was faced with many difficulties. The 84-year cycle of "our cycle," he found, was out of phase with the rest of the world. Moreover, the cycle set forth different weekdays on the Kalends of January (both for common and bissextile years), a different first month (Nisan) and thus a different Paschal moon (luna XIV), and finally a different equinox (that is, Julian 25 March rather than Nicaean 21 March). Even the work of Anatolius, upon whom the Irish *ordo Paschae* depended, could be cited as admitting that no true cycle could be achieved through his rules of computation. On the other hand, Alexandrian Easters could be known either from the table of Victorius or from the Pachomian verses promoted by Mosinu, abbot of Bangor. There survive tables of Irish origin which show that different systems of Victorius and Dionysius were being compared by scholars on various occasions.<sup>41</sup> But finally the cycle of the 318 bishops, said Cummián, is correctly calculated in a very clear table so that, leaving behind the darkness of ignorance and taking note of all the assembled data, anyone can come to a certain knowledge of the date of Easter.<sup>42</sup> Could one give a rational account of them?



What was needed was education in cycles of sun and moon and in basic arithmetic. This is what Cumman argued would lead to the truth, and it is what he called upon Ségene to provide when his letter ended with the exhortation not to err, but especially not to err knowingly.<sup>43</sup> It was knowledge to be found by study both of the scriptures and of the cycles. Bede's great respect for Irish scholarship depends upon this science which flourished within a context of piety.

Old science is dull reading and mercifully tends to disappear. There survives, however, some fragmentary evidence in many manuscripts that drills in arithmetic were done, even though mistakes are occasionally found. Especially numerous are sections of computistical cycles and computistical *argumenta*, which either explain how to apply the principles or how to get the answer directly without any principles. Broader studies of natural phenomena made their appearance in this way, attracted to pages of computistical texts and other schoolbooks.

One of the most important schoolbooks of our period was written in Seville in A. D. 612 by Isidore. I am not referring to his encyclopedic *Origines*, first drafted in 612 x 620 and developed in several versions to supply all sorts of information to those who read or preached the scripture. Rather, I mean his schoolbook, *De Natura Rerum*, which was intended to guide the basic scientific education of anyone and seems to have done so for almost everyone for several centuries.<sup>44</sup> The extent to which it was known in insular schools is not at all clear, however. Within the Celtic range from Britons to southern Irish, one finds the use of one or another word or phrase which could have derived from the *De Natura Rerum*; but Fontaine could only assume that it had reached Ireland on the basis of verbal images in the added chapter 44. However, it was transcribed in Clm 396 by an early ninth-century scribe who certainly was trained in the Hisperic practices, as revealed in his colophon. And the commentary on *Donatus Maior* in MS St. Paul-in-Karnten Stiftsbibliothek 25.2.16 (s.VIII in.) ff. 21-42 contains an epilogue *Ad Cuimnanum* with further passages reported to have Isidore's school-book as a source, copied by an Anglo-Saxon hand.<sup>45</sup>

What then of Saxon schools? In the monastery of Malmesbury Aldhelm was educated by the Irish Máeldubh, according to William of Malmesbury. Although Aldhelm's somewhat abstruse prose often invites comment, his was not a purely literary education. He wrote of three *disciplinae philosophorum: Physica, Ethica, and Logica*, of which the seven *fisicae artes* were listed by him in three separate works and cited in a fourth:

*Arithmetica, Geometrica, Musica, Astronomia, Astrologia, Mechanica, Medicina.*<sup>46</sup> He learned a little arithmetic but admitted that *difficillima rerum argumenta et calculi supputatione, quas partes numeri appellant, lectionis instantia repperi.*<sup>46a</sup> This probably referred to those number groups which one has to keep in mind when multiplying or dividing. Roman *calculi* were the pebbles or roundels moved across a board for calculations, in other words, a form of *abacus*. The reckoning learned at Malmesbury may not have satisfied his later master at St. Augustine's Canterbury in the monastic school of Hadrian (ca. 670-672), and like most students, Aldhelm regarded "all my past labour of study as of little value," since he could keep those *partes numeri* in mind only with a struggle and when "sustained by heavenly grace."<sup>47</sup> But the fuller range of *arithmetica* was included with the *computus*, a subject with which Aldhelm was very much concerned. He seems to have known the letter sent by Bishop Vitalinus of Rome (657-672)<sup>48</sup> to King Oswiu of Northumbria before the Council of Whitby, as is indicated in his letter to Geraint, king of Devon and Cornwall and to the bishops of Devon and Cornwall. He wished to convince them that the 84-year cycle with *lunae XIV-XX* should be abandoned in favour of the rules of the 318 fathers. Those fathers at the Council of Nicaea sanctioned a 19-year cycle in a perpetual *laterculus* which ran *per ogdoadam et endicadam* with Paschal limits *luna XV-XXI*, according to Aldhelm. On the other hand the 19-year computation of Anatolius and the 84-year rule of Sulpicius Severus "observe the paschal solemnity on *luna XIV* along with the Jews" which is an Oriental heresy; they should be set aside "since neither follows the bishops of the Roman Church in their perfect method of computation." Before continuing his explanation of the heretical "quartodecimans," Aldhelm added that the Roman bishops "also declared that the paschal *computus* of Victorius, which observes a cycle of 532 years, should not be followed in future."<sup>49</sup> This appeal to Geraint and his bishops is set within a general appeal to unity with the church fathers and to their charity, in contrast to the bishops of Dyfed. His appeal to the see of Peter is made with respect only to the question of Easter and, in that regard, echoes Wilfrid's claim as repeated by Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3, 25. As Michael Herren has pointed out,<sup>50</sup> the letter carries out the appeal of Theodore to the Synod of Hertford (September, 672) and its first canon "that we all keep Easter Day at the same time, namely on the Sunday after the fourteenth day of the moon of the first month" (Bede, *HE* 4.2), and it



could have been written at the behest of any widely attended council with the same concerns thereafter, during Aldhelm's abbacy of Malmesbury (673/4? - 705/6). The Britons in Wales, subject to the kingdom of Wessex, accepted the new *ordo Paschae* in the year that Aldhelm became bishop of Sherborne (705/6).

The English settlement of Easter problems at Whitby in 664 favoured an Alexandrian reckoning in Dionysian terms, which was justified partly in the language of Petrine mythology that must have appealed to Irish *Romani* as well as to bishops of Canterbury. But it was accepted in Iona only in A. D. 729. British participation in these matters has left almost no record until the tenth century.<sup>51</sup> Some of those subject to Wessex accepted it in 884, but others, only in 909, under the authority of the Saxon see of Crediton.

The terms for the seven *fisicae artes* used by Aldhelm could have been found in Isidore's *Differentiarum Libri Duo*, sections 149-152. Aldhelm's references to *geometria*, *astronomia*, and *astrologia* were augmented from Isidore's *Origines* 3.10.3 (geometry concerns measure of lengths and the terms of measurement) and *De Natura Rerum* 18 and 24-26. *Astrologia* pertains to rising, falling, visibility, and circular courses of stars through the heavens as they circle the earth, while *astronomia* or the non-Isidorian term *lex astrorum* accounts for the movements of planets and their periods of orbit. Although the terms themselves had been used by Roman *mathematici* (that is, astrologers and magicians), in the hands of both Isidore and Aldhelm there is a complete absence of number mysticism and astral influences.<sup>51a</sup> On the other hand, Aldhelm seems to have used the knowledge gained at Canterbury of "arithmetic and all the mysteries of the stars in the heavens." In this letter from Canterbury to a West Saxon bishop, he emphasized "intense disputation of computation"; the profound subject of the "zodiac, the circle of twelve signs that rotates at the peak of heaven"; and "the complex reckoning of the horoscope" which "requires laborious investigation of the expert."<sup>52</sup> *Horoscopus* in this context means an instrument for reckoning astronomical phenomena, such as the sundial moonfinder, or *horologium nocturnum* - a timetable of stellar night movements.<sup>53</sup> Furthermore, there is extant in several manuscripts a *Cyclus Aldhelmi de Cursu Lunae per Signa XII Secundum Grecos*, based upon a synodical moon of 29½ days. From this cycle was generated the lunar A-P series, which survives in four manuscripts without the table. This is one of several efforts to determine the relation of the moon to

the zodiac: that band of heavenly space through which sun and moon pass and which was arbitrarily described in twelve equal sections by names of constellations (some of which are extremely difficult actually to see). The *Cyclus Aldhelmi* was not successful and dropped out of use very early because it was based upon the synodical rather than the sidereal moon (27 1/3 days). Bede made this correction, while computists at Fleury and Auxerre attempted further adaptations, though none of these tables made a lasting contribution to knowledge. This series of efforts at observation and calculation of the moon's course could not attain sufficient precision for lack of an adequate instrument, a need which began to be met only in the last quarter of the tenth century with the first Latin astrolabe.<sup>54</sup>

The works of Bede could supply much more evidence, of course, for *arithmetica* and *astronomia*, and his works are being assessed very fruitfully in terms of scientific assumptions and accomplishments which have been heretofore cited more often than understood.<sup>55</sup> Beyond Jarrow and Wearmouth, however, there was a study of these essential scientific subjects in many schools, which has been little suspected and which may normally be traced by attention to evidence of *computistica*. To what has, thus far, been presented may be added yet another scientific concern which may be illustrated by a description of a fourth and especially English version of Isidore's *De Natura Rerum*. It is concerned with the shape of the whole earth, its continents, and its discovery with reference to the shape of the heavens.

Cummian led us through the groundwork of Paschal questions in Ireland, and he will also lead us to Isidore among the West Saxons as well as to the earth as a globe.<sup>56</sup> There is only one surviving manuscript of Cummian's letter, MS London BL Cotton Vitellius A.XIII, f. 79-83. In the binding it was given after the Robert Cotton fire of 1731 seven different books were put together, and the first of these is itself a small collection which was transcribed in great haste towards the end of the eleventh century, f. 4-72 (new foliation). It contains Hrabanus' *De Computo*, a set of computistical memory verses, Isidore's *De Natura Rerum*, with the whole enclosed by a short work by Abbo of Fleury. At the very beginning is the *Penitential* of Egbert, and at the end is a *Martyrology* from the West Country. This is another instance of science within a context of piety; where it was all written, I do not know. However, its central contents duplicate those of MS Exeter 3507, written a century earlier in large and beautiful Anglo-Saxon



cursive, from about A. D. 960 to 986. There are a half dozen English manuscripts with excerpts of Hrabanus' *computus*, and there are also six English manuscripts from the tenth to the fourteenth centuries containing Isidore's *De Natura Rerum*. There is, however, no overlap between the two groups,<sup>57</sup> save the Exeter and Vitellius copies.

It can be shown that both Aldhelm and Bede used the short version of Isidore.<sup>58</sup> From the text and studies presented by Jacques Fontaine,<sup>59</sup> we know that the short forty-six-chapter version was sent by the author to young King Sisebut of the Visigoths in A. D. 612, and that the king responded in a verse letter that shows how useful the work would be by providing a systematic explanation of a solar eclipse, illustrated by an excellent diagram. But Isidore added another chapter in A. D. 613 concerning the sphere of the earth in three continents, and added drawings of the *rota terrarum*. Someone else added a chapter on the seas and winds and elaborated parts of other chapters for the long version.

It was the last described long version which I expected to find in Exeter and Vitellius, but this text has been elaborated even more in dozens of places. Moreover, this fourth version has been glossed with lines taken from the Epistle of Sisebut but attributed to Isidore; this implies that Aldhelm's short version of *De Natura Rerum* with the anonymous letter had been used to gloss the English fourth version. Finally, the name of Isidore had been set aside in favour of attribution to Gildas, a change which occurred also in Hrabanus' *computus*. In fact, these works were receiving a great deal of attention and development during the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries - doubtless in schools where Irish, Saxon, and Briton interacted with each other as student, master, monk: schools such as Oswald's Gloucester, Aldhelm's Malmesbury, or Glastonbury, where interest in Gildas flourished. In these establishments argument could and did occur about the correct *computus*, cycles of sun and moon, and positions of planets through the zodiacal band.

Since A. D. 613, Isidore's *De Natura Rerum* concluded with chapter 48, *De partibus terrae*, and a *rota terrarum*, one of seven illustrated chapters. The *rota terrarum* is a well-known diagram and, generally, not taken seriously by cartographers. But its use by Isidore in the early seventh century left us the earliest exemplars which are still extant. The diagram was oriented not to the north (as modern cartographers prefer) but to the east, normally. It was the basis for the earliest real maps in the late eighth century, maps which display known (but very distant) islands in the seas, according to a distorting

curvature.<sup>60</sup> For *partes septentrionales*, this gave a visual context for Cumian's image of *mentagrae orbis terrarum*.<sup>61</sup>

In the two earliest manuscripts of the fourth version, the English version of *De Natura Rerum*, Domitian I (s.X<sup>2</sup>), has the standard tripartite *rota*, but the Exeter 3507 (s.X<sup>ex</sup>) has a more elaborate figure which includes three lists of place names. These names are grouped under continent headings *Asia*, *Africa*, *Europa* - but with an unexpected reversal: *Africa* is on the lower left, *Europa* on the lower right. Historians of cartography have been satisfied to say that this reversal was merely an ancient error when it occurred in manuscripts of Sallust or Lucan, and especially of Isidore.<sup>62</sup> Among historians of science it is a commonplace that medieval scribes are notorious for silly errors, and that nothing was too gauche for Isidore. My own collations of *computus* texts have turned up errors, but sometimes they may reveal a busy mind. How could intelligent scholars accept and use a reversed *rota*?

A possible explanation may be sought in astronomy, both past and present. There have always been two perspectives on the globe of the heavens and its stellar phenomena which would result in two quite different projections of star charts and land charts.<sup>63</sup> If the scholar looks up at the sky with *Asia* and its *Oceanus orientalis* at his head, then *Europa est dextera*, *Africa est laeva*. On the other hand, if he imagines himself outside the globe and looking east, he would see *Europa est laeva*, *Africa est dextera*. Both perspectives are found in the popular literature of Aratus and Hyginus, as well as in sophisticated planispheres of Fulda and of Salzburg, which I have elsewhere called Hipparchan and Ptolemaic.<sup>64</sup> Geographers prepared *picturae* of their terrestrial spheres, normally with *Asia* and its *Oceanus orientalis* at the head of a chart, and the other parts were projected on the flat surface according to either perspective. From the outer perspective *Europa est laeva*, as with MS Domitian; from the inner perspective *Europa est dextera*, as with MS Exeter, requiring that one keep in mind a distinction between regions of the heavens and regions of the earth.

Thus, we may recognize two conventions for representing the heavens, each of which had intelligible consequences. Neither the Isidorian image nor the reversed image of the globe indicates a lack of understanding, a failure of observation, or a repetition of error. Both may be best understood in terms of a priority of the spherical cosmos and spherical earth.



In conclusion, therefore, we have abundant evidence of piety but only scraps of science. The holy Fintan is remembered by a *Vita* which mentions Laisrén only because he was awestruck by sanctity. But the warning of Cummian to Ségeine of Iona was forceful. His argument for a new *ordo Paschae* was heeded slowly but surely by others, mostly anonymous, who learned their *calculi supputatio* on reckoning boards with Aldhelm, observed the equinox with Bede, and counted epacts and tested various *computi* until they found that the Dionysian system really did work. This was *computistica* which encompassed the cycles of sun and moon and planets for their own sake and certainly went well beyond the needs of Easter dates, in the service of Christian unity and apostolicity.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The scholarly conflict about the Alexandrian, Milanese, Roman, Victorian, and Celtic systems for determining the date for Easter - all of which flourished in the seventh century - have generated much literature in the twentieth century as well. The best historical introduction is by C. W. Jones, *Beda's Opera de Temporibus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1943), pp. 3-122, to be supplemented below.

<sup>2</sup>The Synod of Whitby was presented as a closed case by Bede *HE* 3.25. The monks of Iona celebrated Easter correctly (according to Bede) on the 24 April, A. D. 729, as a result of Egbert's preaching and holy life among them; Egbert who had studied in Ireland thus completed the work of the Scots Aidan, who had brought holiness from Iona to Northumbria (*HE* 5.22), and Adomnan who spread the Northumbrian teaching among most northern Irish except his own Iona.

Abbo studied in the monastery of St. Benoît-sur-Loire at Fleury, long an important centre of computistical studies. His letters to Gerald and Asper in A. D. 1003-1004 challenged Bede's acceptance of Dionysius Exiguus' tables for A. D. 532-611 and their historical assumptions, and justified a 22-year shift in the year of the Incarnation. One of his two letters on this topic was published by Pierre Varin (1849) and reprinted by A. Cordoliani, "Abbon de Fleury, Hériger de Lobbes et Gerland de Besançon, sur l'ère de l'incarnation de Denys le Petit," *Revue de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 44 (1949): 463-87; there are three Gerald's to be distinguished. A second letter survives in five manuscripts but has not been edited.

<sup>3</sup>Grammar, song, and reckoning are broad fields which included those studies which were essential for monastic schools in their vocational purposes, just as the seven arts of Hellenistic instruction had been considered useful for the very different purposes of the Roman elite. Carolingian romanizers attempted to reinforce the learning of their schools by citing the categories of Roman pedagogy from Boethius, Cassiodorus, or Isidore; but the working patterns of their schools are better expressed through the practices of *grammatica*, *cantica*, *computistica*. See W. Stevens, Introduction to *Rabani De Computo CCCM* 44 (Turnhout, 1979): 165-68. This emphasis has been explored in many essays by C. W. Jones.

<sup>4</sup>"Tres opciones dantur tibi, Lasreane: id est, duo libri in ignem mittentur, liber veteris ordinis et noui, ut videamus, quis eorum de igne liberabitur; vel duo monachi, unus meus, alter tuus, in unam domum recludantur; et domus comburatur, et videbimus, quis ex eis evadat intactus igne. Aut eamus ad sepulcrum mortui iusti monachi, et resuscitemus eum, et indicet nobis, quo ordine debemus hoc anno Pascha celebrare." *Vita Sancti Munnu* 27, ed. C. Plummer (Oxford, 1910; rep. 1968), 2: 237.



Concerning the manuscript see P. Grosjean "Notes sur quelques sources des Antiquitates de Jacques Ussher," *AB* 77 (1959): 154-87; and W. M. Stevens, "Introduction: Manuscripts and Editions," *Rabani Mogontiacensis Episcopi De Computo CCCM* 44 (Turnhout, 1979): 194.

This event and Cumian's letter have been discussed many times: cf. B. MacCarthy, "Introduction," *The Annals of Ulster* (Dublin, 1901), 4: cxxxviii-cxlii; J. Schmid, *Die Osterfestberechnung auf den britischen Inseln vom Anfang des vierten bis zum Ende des achten Jahrhunderts* (Regensburg, 1904), pp. 37-41; D. J. O'Connell, "Easter Cycles in the Early Irish Church," *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland* 66, 1 (1936): 80-81; and C. W. Jones, *Bedae Opera de Temporibus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1943), pp. 89-98.

<sup>5</sup> *Epistola Cumiani* survives in a unique transcript from the late eleventh or early twelfth century: MS London BL Cotton Vitellius A.XII, ff. 79-83. It was edited by James Ussher, *Veterum Epistolarum Hibernicarum Sylloge* (Dublin, 1632), pp. 24-35; rep. *Works* (1864), 4: 432-43; the much emended version in PL 76: 969-978 was also based on Ussher but is unreliable. See also the textual corrections by M. Esposito, "Latin Learning and Literature in Medieval Ireland," *Hermathena* 45 (1930): 240-45. A much needed critical edition and translation has been prepared by Maura Walsh O'Cróinín and should be published.

<sup>6</sup> No specific evidence has been presented to support various suggestions to identify the author of *Epistola Cumiani* with either Clonfert or Durrow, or with other persons of this name. There was, however, a Cumaine Fota (Cumianus or Comianus or Cumineus Longus, the "tall") who died in A. D. 662 at the age of 72 as abbot of Clonfert. He wrote a hymn, *Celebra Iuda* (and a penitential (expl.: "Finitus est hic liber scriptus a Cominiano"), ed. L. Bieler and D. A. Binchy, *The Irish Penitentials* (Scriptores Latini Hiberniae 5 [Dublin, 1963]: 108-35; see also pp. 5-7 and 17-19.) It is not necessary to assume that Cumaine Fota's reputation for learning was based exclusively on *Sacra Scriptura*, yet nothing reveals on his part an interest in the earlier debates about Easter or in the disciplines necessary for resolving those problems.

<sup>7</sup> See sketch maps 1 and 4 provided by Kathleen Hughes, *Early Christian Ireland: Introduction to the Sources* (Ithaca, 1972), pp. 111, 139.

<sup>8</sup> MacCarthy, *Annals of Ulster* 4: cxlii; J. K. Kenney, *Sources for the Early History of Ireland: I Ecclesiastical* (New York, 1929; rep. 1966) p. 224, n. 187; J. Ryan, *Irish Monasticism* (Dublin, 1931), pp. 198, 200, 208-9, 215.

<sup>9</sup> "Sed non post multum surrexit quidam paries dealbatus, traditionem seniorum servare se simulans; qui utraque non fecit unum, sed divisit, et irritum ex parte fecit quod promissum est: quem Dominus (ut spero) percutiet quoquo modo voluerit," ed. Ussher, *Works*, 4: 442.

<sup>10</sup> "Quid autem pravius sentiri potest de Ecclesia matre, quam si dicamus Roma errat, Hierosolyma errat, Alexandria errat, Antiochia errat, totus mundus errat: soli tantum Scoti et Britones rectum sapiunt." ed. Ussher, *Works* 4: 438-39: "What more derogatory can be thought of mother church than to say: Rome errs, Jerusalem errs, Alexandria errs, Antioch errs, the whole world errs; only Scots and Britons think rightly?"

<sup>11</sup> "Misimus quos novimus sapientes et humiles esse, velut natos ad matrem, et properum iter in voluntate Dei habentes, et ad Romam urbem aliqui ex eis venientes, tertio anno ad nos usque pervenerunt...et in uno hospitio cum Graeco et Hebraeo, Scythia et Aegyptiaco in Ecclesia sancti Petri simul in Pascha (in quo mense integro disjuncti sumus) fuerunt: et ante sancta testati sunt nobis, dicentes: 'Per totum orbem terrarum hoc Pascha, ut scimus, celebratur.'" ed. Ussher, *Works* 4: 442-43: "We sent men we knew to be wise and humble, as sons to a mother; and having completed the journey successfully by God's will, some of those who reached Rome returned to us in the third year...In one hospice they were with a Greek and a Hebrew, a Scythian and an Egyptian, and they were united together in the Church of St. Peter on Easter (at which time we Scots are different by a whole month). And before holy objects they swore this, saying: 'Throughout the whole world this Easter is celebrated, as we know.'"

<sup>12</sup> "Vos considerate quae sunt conventicula quae dixi: utrum Hebraei et Graeci et Latini et Aegyptii simul in observatione praecipuarum solennitatum uniti; an Britonum Scotorumque particula, qui sunt pene extremi, et, ut ita dicam, mentagrae orbis terrarum; hoc mihi iudicate." ed. Ussher, *Works*, 4: 436: "Consider who are the conventicles! Judge for me whether they are the Hebrews, Greeks, Latins, and Egyptians - all united in observance of the chief holy days, or the particle of Britons and Scots who are almost at the ends and (I might put in this way) are protrusions upon the world."

*Mentagrae* was used literally for pimples in Pliny's *Historia Naturalis* 26.2, but is otherwise rare; see M. Esposito, "Latin learning," pp. 240-45.

<sup>13</sup> Ed. Ussher, *Works*, 4: 440.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 435.

<sup>15</sup> The conflation of these traditions in the edition of the Benedictines of Saint-Maur, *Collectio Conciliorum Galliae* (1789), was preferred by K. J. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte* 1 (1855): 201-19; French trans. by H. Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles* 1 (Paris, 1907): 275-98. Although Hefele printed an additional six canons (beyond the usual twenty-two) found in MS Lucca B. Capitolare 124 (s. IX) by J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* (Florence, 1759) 2: 469-74, he rejected the shorter version of Marinus' letter found there and apparently in all surviving manuscripts with the exception of MS Paris BN lat. 1711. Annotations by Leclercq indicate reasons to question the authenticity of the long version of the letter as well as the heading and portions of the first canon. The improbable reference to DC episcopi appears only in a few manuscripts, and the alternate CC episcopi occurs as a variant in Augustine's *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani* 1. 5 (PL 43: 40-41), rather than XXXIII in the usual heading and a somewhat larger number of actual names of bishops, priests, and deacons listed. Thus the search for Cumian's source could be narrowed somewhat.

<sup>16</sup> Paschal letters from metropolitan bishops: see C. W. Jones, ed., *Bedae Opera*, pp. 10-11, 17, 24-25, ff.

<sup>16a</sup> A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, eds., *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*. 3 vols. (Oxford, 1869-78), 1: 7; also Mansi, 2: 466-67.



<sup>17</sup>For British bishops at Arles see B. Krusch, "Die Einführung des griechischen Paschalritus im Abendlande," *Neues Archiv* 9 (1884): 167.

<sup>17a</sup>For the use of Patrick as an authority in the Easter controversy, see Jones, ed., *Beda Opera*, pp. 86-87; 89; 91, n. 3; 93; 95, n. 1; 101; 109.

<sup>18</sup>Pseudo-Anatolius' *Canon Paschalis* or *Liber de Ratione Paschali*, ed. B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie: Der 84 jährige Osterzyklus und seine Quellen* (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 316-27. Nine manuscripts of the text, whole or fragmentary, have now been identified. Authentic passages from Anatolius were given by Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 7.32, and the Latin translation of A. D. 395 by Rufinus 8.28, cited by Bede, *De Temporum Ratione* 4 (ed. Jones, p. 211), 31 (p. 237), 42 (p. 256).

<sup>19</sup>Jones, ed., *Beda Opera*, pp. 78-87.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 87-89 et passim. A new attempt to sort out the several versions will be outlined in W. M. Stevens, *Catalogue of Computistical Tracts*, soon to be completed. Notice that there was a Caesarea in Mauretania to which Augustine travelled in A. D. 418 to deal with some dispute; see Gerald Bonner, "Augustine's visit to Caesarea in 418," in *Studies in Church History* 1, ed. C. W. Dugmore and C. Duggan (London, 1964) pp. 104-13.

<sup>21</sup>The works of Dionysius are cited from the edition by J. W. Jan, *Historia Cycli Dionysiani cum Argumentis Paschalibus* (1718; 2nd ed., Halle, 1769), rep. PL 67: 19-23, 453-520. For the *Tabula Paschalis* and *Praefatio* Jan used MS Berlin Staatsbibl. Philipps 1830 [cat. 129] (s. IX<sup>2</sup>) f. 2<sup>v</sup> and 4-10<sup>v</sup>; for the letters he used MS Oxford BL Digby 63 (x. IX<sup>2</sup>) f. 63-67 and apparently MS London BL Cotton Caligula A.XV (s. VIII<sup>2</sup>) f. 84-86<sup>v</sup>. Th. Mommsen collated the Digby manuscript once more with Jan's edition, and this was published by B. Krusch, *Die Entstehung unserer heutigen Zeitrechnung*, *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie*, Jahrgang 1937, Philol.-hist. Klasse, Nr. 8 (Berlin, 1938). However, I have now identified fourteen additional manuscripts of the *Epistola ad Petronium* and twenty-three of the *Epistola ad Bonifatium*, many of these earlier than MS Digby 63. Critical editions are needed.

<sup>22</sup>The problem was formal, in that it avoided the Roman habit of reckoning the beginning point twice, that is once from each direction, but it was also practical in that "a year 0 is intolerable in everyday thinking," (K. Harrison, *The Framework of Anglo-Saxon History to A. D. 900* [Cambridge, 1976] p. 37.) Bede's *De Temporum Ratione* 47 was able to rebut the criticism of this solution only with difficulty, and many later scholars were stimulated to offer alternate years for the *annus Incarnationis*, e.g., Florus of Lyons, Abbo of Fleury, Marianus Scotus, Robert of Hereford, et al.

<sup>23</sup>*Exemplum Suggestionis Bonifatii*, ed. B. Krusch; "Ein Bericht der päpstlichen Kanzlei," in *Papsttum und Kaisertum*, *Festschrift P. Kehr*, ed. A. Brackman (Munich, 1926), pp. 56-58.

<sup>24</sup>F. Rühl (*Chronologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* [Berlin, 1897], p. 171) thought that he had found Dionysian indications in Roman documents by A. D. 584, thus implying that his *Tabula Paschalis* was being used. Indictions, however, were an Alexandrian usage which had been present in Paschal tables previous to Dionysius and could be continued without his changes.

<sup>25</sup>Only the first nine of the *Argumenta Paschalia* are authentic, of those attributed to Dionysius in the editions of Jan and Krusch. Many of those which are authentic do not have the proper terms and reckonings for Dionysius' *annus praesens*. Many new manuscripts have been identified since 1937, but all texts have been adapted to later applications. A critical edition is needed.

<sup>26</sup>This explanation follows the proposals of C. W. Jones, *Beda Opera*, pp. 93-97; cf. A. Cordoliani, "Computistes insulaires et les écrits pseudo-Alexandrins," *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* (Paris, 1945/1946), vol. 106 [= 107 (publ. 1948)]: 24-28. The best edition is that of B. Krusch, *Studien* (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 344-49; but thirteen manuscripts have now been identified which would allow for an improved edition and a better account of this rather murky situation. There were two Bonifaces (February to November 607, and 607/8 to 615); and the most prominent question in this letter is the Easter date VIII Kal. Maii (=23 April), as emphasized by K. Harrison, "Luni-Solar Cycles: their Accuracy and Some Types of Usage," in *Saints, Scholars & Heroes: Festschrift in Honour of C. W. Jones*, ed. M. H. King and W. M. Stevens, 2 vols. (Collegeville, Minn., 1979), 2: 73-74.

<sup>27</sup>"Scrutaminique, ut Cyrillus ait, 'quod ordinavit synodus Nicena lunas quartasdecimas omnium annorum per decemvennalem cyclum...' Ussher, *Works*, 4: 440. Cf. *Epistola Cyrilli de Pascha*, ed. Krusch, *Studien* p. 347.

<sup>28</sup>Two others items which also bear the name of Cyril were composed either in Africa, *Praefatio Cyrilli* (A. D. 482?), or in Spain, *Prologus Cyrilli* (A. D. 577-590?), to oppose Victorius of Aquitaine and to promote Alexandrian reckoning. The *Praefatio Cyrilli* cites Theophilus of Alexandria and both were originally accompanied by tables; but there is no indication that either was known to Cumian. See Krusch, *Studien*, pp. 89-98; Jones, *Beda Opera*, pp. 38-54. A Cordoliani, "Textos de Computo Español del siglo IV: El Prologus Cyrilli," *Hispania Sacra* 9 (1956): 127-39.

<sup>29</sup>The best available edition is not very good: L. Muratori, *Anecdota Latina* (Milano-Padua, 1713), 3: 195-96, rep. PL 139: 1357-1358, from MS Milano Bib. Ambrosiana H.150 inf. (x. IX in) f. 80-81<sup>v</sup>. This was reprinted in parallel with a second version from MS Tours B. mun. 334 (x. IX) f. 16<sup>v</sup>-18 by A. Cordoliani, "Computistes insulaires..." p. 30-34. See also C. W. Jones, "The 'Lost' Sirmund Manuscript of Bede's 'Computus,'" *EHR* 52 (1937): 216, and *Beda Opera* (1943), p. 97.

<sup>30</sup>Columbanus, *Epistola ad Gregorium*, ed. G. S. M. Walker, *S. Columbanus Opera* (Dublin, 1957) pp. 2-13.



<sup>31</sup>For details see Kenney, p. 218. The reference to Mosinu maccu Min occurs in an addition to the Gospel of St. Matthew in the Irish MS Würzburg Univ.-Bibl. M.p.th. F.61 (s. VIII<sup>2</sup>) f. 29. There is no support for the notion that this Irishman learned his tables from Dionysius Exiguus, proposed by Paul Grosjean, "Recherches sur les debuts de la controverse pascal chez les Celtes," AB 64 (1946): 215.

<sup>32</sup>Eugippius' version was edited from five manuscripts by P. Knoell, *Eugippii Excerpta ex Operibus S. Augustini* (Vienna, 1885), CSEL 9, 1: 425-44, no. 118: *Ex libro secundo ad eundem Ianuarium. Quid sibi velit in celebratione paschae observatio sabbati et lunae; et de quadragesima vel de consonantia pentecostes cum die legis datae.*

<sup>33</sup>The Herwagen edition of 1563, rep. PL 90: 647-57, is the only version in print and is inadequate.

<sup>34</sup>On this orthography see J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville, Traité de la nature* (Bordeaux, 1960), pp. 94-95.

<sup>35</sup>Victorius' prologue and cycles were edited by B. Krusch, *Studien*, pp. 17-26 and 27-52; rep. PL Supplementum 3 (1963): 381-6 and 387-426. See also the discussion by Krusch, pp. 4-15; and C. W. Jones, *Beda's Opera*, pp. 61-67.

<sup>36</sup>The *Laterculus Victorii* was preferred by bishops in Gaul at the Synod of Orleans in A. D. 541, although it would be an exaggeration to assert that it was uniformly used in the region. It was recognized as a *cyclus recapitulans* by the Spanish monk Leo in A. D. 627 and cited in the *Vita Iohannis Abbatis Reomaensis* of seventh century Bobbio, as well as in the Irish work *De Mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae* 2.4. See Krusch, *Studien*, p. 299; Jones, "The Victorian and Dionysiac Paschal Tables in the West," *Speculum* 9 (1935): 408-13; Harrison *Framework*, pp. 33-34, 64-65. There is no specific evidence that Roman bishops recommended the Victorian usage at any time, so far as I am aware.

<sup>37</sup>The verses occur in the margins of numerous computistical tracts and calendars and were printed from MS Milano B. Ambros. H. 150 inf. (s. IX in) by L. A. Muratori, *Anecdota Latini*, vol. 3; rep. PL 129: 1283; and many other editions, most recently C. W. Jones, "Carolingian Aesthetics: Why Modular Verse?" *Viator* 6 (1975): 388.

<sup>38</sup>Jones, "A legend of St. Pachomius," *Speculum* 17 (1943): 198-210, and *Beda's Opera* pp. 32-33; A. Cordoliani, "Les computistes insulaires," pp. 24-28. Bede's *De Temporum Ratione* 43. 67-75 quoted the passage from Ep. Cyrilli but did not repeat the verse.

<sup>39</sup>C. W. Jones, ed. *Beda's Opera*, pp. 71-72, notes that the pious attribution of Alexandrian tables to the Nicene fathers rather than to the more general *sancti patres* was perhaps an incorrect inference by many, but not a fraud by Dionysius.

<sup>40</sup>Ussher, *Works*, 4: 440. Cf. Dionysius, PL 67: 496.

<sup>41</sup>Victorian and Alexandrian tables were collated in MS Milano B. Ambrosiana H. 150 inf (ca. A. D. 805) f. 125; St. Gallen 248 (s. IX) p. 77; Kbln Dombibl. 83<sup>11</sup> (ca. A. D. 800) f. 59v; Rouen B. mun. 1.49 [Cat. 524] (s. IX) f. 82v; and others. The terms "Dionysius" and

"Victorius" came to refer generally to Alexandrian or old Roman methods. In MS Kbln 83<sup>11</sup> f. 211<sup>v</sup> a table for epacts on the first day of each month in Alexandrian terms has been adjusted to the Victorian cycle.

<sup>42</sup>Ussher, *Works* 4: 449: "...in quo kalendas [sic] Januarii lunaeque ejusdem diei et initia primi mensis ipsiusque XIV. lunae recto jure ac si quodam clarissimo tramite, ignorantiae relictis tenebris, studiosis quibusque cunctis temporibus sunt adnotatae, quibus paschalis sollennitas probabiliter inveniri potest."

<sup>43</sup>Ussher, *Works* 4: 443: "Nefas est enim errata tua non agnoscere, et prolata certiora non approbare. Haereticorum est proprie, sententiam suam non corrigere malle perversam quam mutare defensam."

<sup>44</sup>J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville, Traité de la nature* (Bordeaux, 1960).

<sup>45</sup>Fontaine, ed., pp. 42-45 (additions) and 75-78 (manuscripts and citations). For Isidorian influences in Hisperic literature see M. Herren, *Hisperica Famina* I (Toronto, 1974): 11-22 and 134 (especially use of word *tollus*); the colophon of Clm 396 will be edited by Herren in vol. 2. Concerning the epilogue called *Anonymus ad Cuimnanum*, see B. Bischoff, "Eine verschollene Einteilung der Wissenschaften," *Mittelalterliche Studien* I (Stuttgart, 1966): 282-83.

<sup>46a</sup>In the Letter to Leuthere: see the following note.

<sup>47</sup>K. W. Menninger, *Number Words and Number Symbols* (Eng. trans., Cambridge, Mass., 1969), pp. 305-06, 315-31; E. Alföldi-Rosenbaum, "The Finger Calculus in Antiquity and in the Middle Ages," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 5 (1971): 1-9. Aldhelm's Letters and other works were edited by R. Ehwald, *MGH Auctores Antiquissimi* 15 (Berlin, 1919); see now the English translation by Michael Herren in *Aldhelm, The Prose Works*, trans. M. Lapidge and M. Herren (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 152-53.

<sup>48</sup>A portion of that letter was quoted by Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3. 29. Another part of the letter from Vitalinus is in MS Oxford BL Digby 63 (s. IX<sup>2</sup>) f. 59v; cf. Aldhelm's reference to Victorius in the Letter to Geraint (ref. in next note).

<sup>49</sup>Ehwald ed. pp. 483-84; Herren trans. pp. 158-59.

<sup>50</sup>Herren, trans., pp. 140-43.

<sup>51</sup>Two fragments in Welsh explain an astronomical table which shows the position of the moon in the heavens every day of the year (cf. Bede DTR 19): MS Cambridge Univ. Library Addit. 4543 (A. D. 930-1039?), translated by Ifor Williams, "The Computus Fragment," *BBCS* 3 (1927): 245-72.

<sup>51a</sup>The pagan mathematical philosophy was strongly opposed by Ambrose, Augustine, Boethius, Cassiodorus, Isidore, and almost all Christian teachers, who nevertheless continued to use number and numerical relationships as a heuristic device for elucidating levels of meaning for a literary text. Christian schools rejected Pythagorean number mysticism, however, in favour of what we recognize as basic arithmetic, as found for example in the *Calculus of Victorius* (ca. 450) and the *Arithmetica* of Boethius (ca. 500) - both very popular in monastic and cathedral schools. See further W. M. Stevens, "Computistica et



Astronomica in the Fulda School," in *Saints, Scholars and Heroes* (cited above), 2: 27-28 and notes 2-5.

<sup>52</sup>Epistola no. 1 (perhaps addressed to Leutherius of Winchester, A. D. 670-676), Ehwald, ed. pp. 475-78; Herren, trans. pp. 152-53.

<sup>53</sup>For Bedan observations to determine the equinox by means of horologica inspectione, see K. Harrison, "Easter Cycles and the Equinox in the British Isles," *ASE* 7 (1978): 1-8.

<sup>54</sup>C. W. Jones, *Beda's Pseudepigrapha* (Ithaca, 1939), pp. 68-70; Bede's *DTR* 19, ed. Jones, *Beda's Opera*, pp. 219 and 354; cf. also the Welsh fragment cited in n. 51 above. For the Latin astrolabe, see Marcel Destombes, "Un astrolabe carolingien et l'origine de nos chiffres arabes," *Archives Internationales d'Histoire des Sciences*, nos. 58-59 (1962) pp. 3-45. Rejection of a date before x.XII by Guy Beaujouan, "Enseignement du quadrivium," *Settimane di Studio* 19 (Spoleto, 1972): 658-62, was based upon a lack of literary citation and upon divergent speculations by Destombes and Beaujouan about the early forms of numerals. The Latin words on all parts of the instrument however appear to me to be in the style of tenth-century Visigothic script. I wish to express great appreciation to Professor Destombes for inviting me to handle this astrolabe in his apartment, 24 April, 1975.

<sup>55</sup>See especially the essays by K. Harrison cited above; and also T. R. Eckenrode, "Venerable Bede as a Scientist," *American Benedictine Review* 21 (1971): 486-507, and other essays, together with a dissertation which should be published: "Original Aspects in Venerable Bede's Tidal Theories" (Saint Louis University, 1970).

<sup>56</sup>Germaine Aujac, "L'image du globe terrestre dans la Grèce ancienne," *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences* 27 (1974): 193-210; W. M. Stevens, "The Figure of the Earth in Isidore's 'De Natura Rerum,'" *Isis* 71 (1980): 268-77.

<sup>57</sup>The six English manuscripts are Exeter Cathedral 3507 (A-S minuscule post A. D. 960) f. 67-97<sup>v</sup>; London BL Cotton Domitian I (English Caroline minuscule s.X<sup>2</sup>) f. 3-37; Vitellius A.XII (Norman minuscule s.XI ex) f. 46-64; Oxford, BL Auct. F.3.14 (s.XII) f. 1-19<sup>v</sup>; Auct. F.2.20 (s.XII) f. 1-16<sup>v</sup>; St. John's College CLXXVIII (s. XIV) f. 9-37<sup>v</sup>. A study of these is in preparation.

<sup>58</sup>Two verses of the *Epistula Sisebuto* were quoted in letters of Aldhelm without identification. One of them is repeated in the Exeter and Vitellius MSS as a gloss and attributed to Isidore. Bede's works draw upon Isidore's *De Natura Rerum* but not from any of the chapters which form the median or long version. Note especially Bede's *DNR* 51, "Divisio terrae," which has contents parallel with Isidore's chapter 48 but proceeds to describe the diagram in the opposite direction and does not quote or paraphrase him. Thus it is likely that Aldhelm and Bede used the short and not the long version.

<sup>59</sup>Fontaine ed., pp. 38-45 (n. 34 above).

<sup>60</sup>MS Albi Bibl. Rochegude 29 (x. VIII<sup>2</sup>) f. 57<sup>v</sup> of Languedoc provenance, ed. Fr. Glorie, *Itineraria et Alia Geographica CCSL* 175 (Tournhout, 1965): 467-68, facsimile. MS Vat. Lat. 6018 (s.VIII/IX) f. 63<sup>v</sup>-64 ed. Glorie, *ibid.*; and *Nonumenta Cartographica Vetustioris*

*Aevi*, A. D. 1200-1500, ed. R. Almagia and M. Destombes, vol. I: *Mappemondes* (Amsterdam, 1964), pl. XIX.

<sup>61</sup>In addition, we note that the statement from the Synod of Arles that Easter should be observed on the same day and at the same time per omnem orbem has been given by Cumian as per totum orbem terrarum (quoted above).

<sup>62</sup>Destombes, *Mappemondes* (1964), p. 37 (Sallust); G. R. Crone, "The Hereford World Map" (London, 1949), p. 6: "The draughtsman has carelessly interchanged the names of Africa and Europa."

<sup>63</sup>P. McGurk, "Germanici Caesaris Aratea cum Scholiis, a New Illustrated Witness from Wales," *National Library of Wales Journal* 18 (1973): 197-216, esp. 200-1. Of course anyone may observe modern astronomers using the reversal of East and West in current star-charts on the assumption that one looks up at the stars.

<sup>64</sup>See note 56, above.



The term *geminus stilus*, which serves as partial title for this paper, has been taken from the Preface to Hrabanus Maurus' prose version of the *De Laudibus Sanctae Crucis*. Justifying his intention to write in prose on the same subject on which he had just written in verse, Hrabanus says:

Mos apud veteres fuit ut gemino stylo propria conderent opera, quo jucundiora simul et utiliora sua legentibus forent ingenia. Unde et apud saeculares et apud ecclesiasticos plurimi inveniuntur qui metro et prosa unam eandemque rem descripserunt. Ut de caeteris taceam, quid aliud Prosper ac venerandus vir Sedulius fecisse cernuntur?...Hoc igitur exemplo...ego quidem vilissimus homuncio, opus quod in laudem sanctae crucis metrico stylo condidi, in prosam vertere curavi.<sup>1</sup>

*Geminus stilus* according to this definition is writing on one subject in both prose and verse. The definition clearly differentiates it from the so-called *prosimetrum* or *chantefable*, which alternates prose and verse within one work; Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*<sup>2</sup> or the anonymous *Aucassin et Nicolette*<sup>3</sup> are composed in this manner. Moreover, Hrabanus stresses that "una et eadem res" be treated in verse and in prose, but he does not stipulate the order in which they are to be written, nor does he demand that the same writer compose both versions. Any writer, therefore, who either writes on one subject in prose and verse, or who transposes an earlier prose work into verse or an earlier poetic work into prose, can justly be called a *geminus stilus* writer.

Even though the term *geminus stilus* was coined in the Frankish Empire, writing in this manner was widespread and flourished in England in the two centuries before Hrabanus.<sup>4</sup> Four Anglo-Latin<sup>5</sup> works fall into this category: Aldhelm's *De Virginitate*,<sup>6</sup> Bede's *Vita Sancti Cuthberti*,<sup>7</sup> his *Vita S. Felicis*,<sup>8</sup> and Alcuin's *Vita S. Willibrordi*.<sup>9</sup> Of these only the *Vita S. Felicis* is a prose translation of the work by another author, namely, Paulinus of Nola.<sup>10</sup>

This paper examines the reasons why Anglo-Latin writers wrote in the *geminus stilus*; it proceeds by looking at the opinions which



scholars currently have on this topic, by examining the reasons which the poets give, by comparing the content and structure of the verse with that of the prose, by evaluating the influences of earlier *geminus stilus* writers on the Anglo-Latin authors, and finally by assessing the manuscript evidence.

Modern scholars who have written on *geminus stilus* works are Colgrave,<sup>11</sup> Curtius,<sup>12</sup> Klopsch,<sup>13</sup> and Strunk.<sup>14</sup> Curtius is the authority whom the others follow. He says: "Antiquity did not conceive of poetry and prose as two forms of expression differing in essence and origin"<sup>15</sup> and "the practice [of writing in the *geminus stilus*] shows us that metrical and non-metrical discourse were felt to be interchangeable arts."<sup>16</sup> Klopsch argues: "From the ancient theory of literature the Middle Ages have taken over two views about the relation of prose to verse: one that poetry is older and more valuable than prose; two, that metrical and non-metrical discourse are interchangeable."<sup>17</sup> Strunk talks about the "interchangeability of prose and verse,"<sup>18</sup> and so does Colgrave, even though he is, as far as I can see, the only scholar who defines the term "interchangeable" more closely; to him it means "that the same subject could be treated in prose or verse without materially altering the sense."<sup>19</sup> Like Curtius, Colgrave points to the *geminus stilus* writers as proof of his theory, and examines especially the Bedan double version of the *Vita S. Cuthberti*.<sup>20</sup> In effect, both Curtius and Colgrave reduce the *geminus stilus* versions to a "literary" or "rhetorical exercise."<sup>21</sup> Curtius claims, for instance, "that a large part of early Christian poetry is a continuation of the antique rhetorical practice of paraphrase."<sup>22</sup>

This explanation is not quite satisfactory. We are told that the *geminus stilus* writers compose two versions of their works because they wish to paraphrase whichever one they wrote first, and in doing this they show that prose and verse are interchangeable. The "rhetorical practice of paraphrase" may well have been the midwife at the birth of the *geminus stilus*; I question, however, whether the twins thus born (to remain with the image) were really identical, that is, fully interchangeable.

In view of Colgrave's and Curtius' statements, the most striking feature is the total absence of any remarks by either Aldhelm, Bede or Alcuin which would indicate that they are writing their *geminus stilus* works in order to show the interchangeability of prose and verse. Instead, all three give the differences between the two styles as the

reason for their writing.

Aldhelm, the most verbose of the three, announces at the end of his prose *De Virginitate* that he will attempt to write a poetic version of the work which he was just about to finish:

iactis iam rethoricis fundamentis et constructis prosae  
parietibus, cum tegulis trochaicis et dactylicis metrorum  
imbricibus firmissimum culmen caelesti confisus suffragio  
imponam.<sup>23</sup>

He will only embark on such a difficult task, however, if his prose is acceptable to the nuns to whom he is dedicating it, especially since

metrica leporis elegantia et rethoricae disertitudinis  
eloquentia tantum altrinsecus discrepent, quantum distat  
dulcis sapa a merulento temeto.<sup>24</sup>

Very early in the poetic version he resumes this theme of the difference between prose and verse; addressing God, Aldhelm says:

Qui latebras mundi geminato sidere demis;  
Nempe diem Titan et noctem Cynthia comit;  
Piscibus aequoreos qui campos pinguibus ornas  
Squamigera formans in glauco gurgite turmas;  
Limpida praepetibus sic complens aera catervis,  
Garrula quae rostris resonantes cantica pipant  
Atque creatorem diversa voce fatentur:  
Da plus auxilium clemens, ut carmine possim  
Inclita sanctorum modulari gesta priorum<sup>25</sup>  
Ut prius ex prosa laudabat littera castos.

The imagery of this passage revolves around the idea of "geminatus." God created twin heavenly bodies, the sun and the moon; he created twin elements, the water and the air which he filled with "floating" animals. Recognizing this pattern the poet, a "creator" himself, having already praised the virgins *ex prosa*, now wishes to sing their deeds *carmine*.

It is not until the conclusion of the poetic *De Virginitate*, however, that the parallel between the *geminatum sidus* and Aldhelm's *geminus stilus* can be more fully established. Aldhelm takes leave from his readers with these words:

Nunc in fine precor prosam metrumque legentes,  
Hoc opus ut cuncti rimentur mente benigna,  
Dum patulis lustrent textum sub fronte fenestris,  
Quod geminum constat discretis forte libellis.<sup>26</sup>

The two words *opus*....*geminum* seem to be a deliberate echo of the *geminato sidere* of the introduction; the use of the singular instead of the plural in both word pairs seems to emphasize the parallel.<sup>27</sup>



Throughout the above quoted passages Aldhelm concentrates on the differences between prose and verse; prose is the walls of the house, verse the roof; one is *dulcis sapa*, the other *merulentum temetum*; one is compared to the sun, the other to the moon; one is water filled with fish, the other air filled with fowl. The images are consistent: each of the items mentioned bears a resemblance to the other in the pair, and yet is different. The implication is that verse and prose are alike (presumably in that they both communicate with words), but that they are also quite different (presumably in their effect and in the methods which they are using).

Neither Bede nor Alcuin are as poetic or as verbose when they give their reasons for duplicating their works. In the prologue to the verse *Vita S. Cuthberti*, Bede briefly announces that he will write another work (without specifying whether it will be prose or verse) because more miracles performed by Cuthbert had come to his attention: "spero me in alio opere nonnulla ex his [gestis], quae praeter miseram, memoriae redditurum."<sup>28</sup> In the preface to the prose version he alludes to this promise: "promisi me alias de uita et miraculis eius latius esse scripturum. Quam uidelicet promissionem in praesenti opusculo... adimplere satago."<sup>29</sup> Again, there is no specific reference to the fact that this second work is in fact prose, unless the word "latius" is interpreted as alluding to Isidore's definition of prose, which derives it from (1) *prosum* = *prorsum* = straightforward; (2) *profusa* = extended; and (3) from the fact "quod spatiosius proruat."<sup>30</sup> The term "latius" may thus be used in two senses: it may indicate that additional material has been included in the second version, and that it is written in prose and is therefore more profuse than verse.

This particular reference is inconclusive; Bede's reasons for translating Paulinus of Nola's *Vita S. Felicis* from verse to prose, however, contain some very useful information; since Paulinus' work, says Bede

Metricis potius quam simplicibus sunt habiles lectoribus, placuit nobis ob plurimorum utilitatem, eandem sancti confessoris historiam planioribus dilucidare sermonibus, ejusque imitari industriam qui martyrium beati Cassiani de metrico opere Prudentii in commune apertumque omnibus eloquium transtulit.<sup>31</sup>

The difference between verse and prose is responsible for Bede's writing the prose version; the prose is useful to a greater number of people, it is clearer, it is the common speech which is understood by everyone.

Verse, accordingly, is obscure and therefore of little use to the majority of the people.<sup>32</sup>

Alcuin presents a similar reason for his writing of a double version:

duos digessi libellos, unum prosaico sermone gradientem, qui puplice fratribus in ecclesia...legi potuisset; alterum Piereo pede currentem, qui in secreto cubili inter scholasticos tuos tantummodo ruminare debuisset.<sup>33</sup>

The prose, which is *gradiens*, can obviously be followed more easily than the verse, which is *currens*. By addressing the prose to the brothers in the church and the verse to the students in their chambers, Alcuin, like Bede, emphasizes the differences between the two styles.

Alcuin's preface to the poem presents the same idea again, but in different words:

Aera minuta duo diversi ponderis ista,  
Sancte pater, supplex in tua templa fero.  
Sed prius aes retinet planis nummismata figuris,  
Posterius sed iam Pierium rutilat.<sup>34</sup>

The *diversi ponderis* of these lines is reminiscent of Aldhelm's *diversa voce*; the *planis figuris* of Bede's *planioribus sermonibus*.

Not one of these three writers claims that, in Colgrave's words, "the same subject could be treated in prose or verse without materially altering the sense." Instead, Bede and Alcuin provide a prose version, because the verse is too difficult for the ordinary audience. Even though Aldhelm does not share this attitude, because his verse seems to be a simplification of his difficult prose, he nonetheless emphasizes the difference between the two styles in the images he produces.

The fact that these authors cite the differences between the two styles as the reason for their writing in the *geminus stilus* does not contradict Colgrave's and Curtius' statements, but it does shift the emphasis. Doubtless prose can express the same ideas as verse; however, the writers of the *geminus stilus* works do not set out to prove this contention, and if they prove it, they do so only incidentally.

Important as the statements made by the authors in their prefaces or works are, they only present part of the evidence; a comparison of the content and structure of the prose works with the content and structure of the verse works will determine more accurately to what extent they are supposed to be interchangeable.

Neither of the poetic versions of the three authors is an exact versification of the prose. To be sure, some passages differ only



minimally.<sup>35</sup> Even a superficial glance at the prose and verse, however, can determine that they do not entirely consist of such minimally different passages. We read the first two hundred lines of Aldhelm's *Carmen de Virginitate* before we find any extended parallels in the prose. With the exception of chapter 9, the first twenty chapters of the *Prosa de Virginitate* are not paralleled in the beginning of the *Carmen*; chapters 1 to 8 and 14 to 20 have no parallels at all; chapters 11 to 13, from which Aldhelm draws some material for lines 2446-2762 of the *Carmen*, are considerably expanded there, and appear towards the end of the poem, and not towards the beginning as in the prose. All in all, some 400 lines of the total 2904 of the *Carmen* introduce material not found in the prose, and an additional ca. 350 lines expand on ideas proposed only briefly in the prose. Conversely, some 25 of the 60 chapters of the prose are not paralleled in the verse, and an additional 3 chapters differ in content.<sup>36</sup>

The differences in Bede's two versions are not quite as pronounced. As with Aldhelm, the introduction differs. Moreover, two chapters of the poetry (nos. 6 and 43) have no equivalent in the prose; five chapters in the prose are not paralleled in the poem; an additional three prose chapters (35 to 37) are only summarily hinted at in the poem. In addition to this the order of three chapters is changed; prose chapters 26, 27, 28, 29 correspond to verse chapters 23, 30, 31, 24 and prose chapters 40, 41, 42 correspond to verse chapters 38, 41, and 39.

Similarities of content between Alcuin's prose and verse versions begin with prose chapter 6; only a few minor differences appear after that: prose chapter 11 is not in the poem and chapter 13 of the poem is not in the prose. Alcuin's verse contains, however, one important structural change: prose chapters 1 to 3, which deal with Willibrord's conception and birth, do not appear in the beginning, but at the end of the poem. This structural change is probably made in order to elevate the prose biography or history of Willibrord to an epic. The history narrates the events in the order in which they occur; the poem changes the order by plunging in *medias res*.

As this enumeration of the differences shows, the Anglo-Latin writers add to or subtract from the material of the first version, or they change its order. The differences which appear between the first and second versions suggest that to varying degrees these authors were interested not only in a transferral from prose to verse or verse to

prose<sup>37</sup> but also in a revision or reworking of the first version.

Aldhelm, Alcuin, and Bede could look back to a large number of writers who preceded them in reworking earlier versions. Arator, Dracontius, Avitus, Juvenius, and Sedulius recast "books of the Bible.. in hexameters;"<sup>38</sup> Paulinus of Perigueux and Venantius Fortunatus transposed Sulpicius Severus' *Vita S. Martini* into verse;<sup>39</sup> Prosper of Aquitaine turned Augustine's *sententiae* into epigrams;<sup>40</sup> in a letter to Eustochium, St. Jerome mentions that Damasus wrote in praise of virginity in both prose and verse (the title of this work suggests a parallel to Aldhelm's *geminum opus*, but it is no longer extant);<sup>41</sup> Bede mentions an anonymous author who translated Prudentius' *Peristephanon* 9 into prose.<sup>42</sup> This enumeration of authors and works indicates that most *geminus stilus* writers preceding the Anglo-Latin authors turn a pre-existing prose text into verse; only two, namely Sedulius and possibly Damasus, are responsible for both versions; and only one turns a pre-existing verse into prose.

Obviously not all these writers are equally influential on the Anglo-Latin authors, and therefore I will consider only those for whom a strong influence can be demonstrated.

Bede is one of the first scholars to comment on the connection between Aldhelm and Sedulius: "Scripsit et de uirginitate librum eximium, quem in exemplum Sedulii geminato opere et uersibus exametris et prosa composuit."<sup>43</sup> About forty verbal parallels<sup>44</sup> between the *Carmen de Virginitate* and the *Carmen Paschale* make Aldhelm's indebtedness to Sedulius obvious; Aldhelm even quotes six lines of the *Carmen Paschale* at various places in his *Prosa de Virginitate*.<sup>45</sup> Sedulius subdivides the miracles on which he is writing into Old and New Testament miracles,<sup>46</sup> a division which Aldhelm seems to follow by separating the Old Testament virgins from those of the New Testament.<sup>47</sup> Aldhelm may even have imitated the relationship of the prose to the verse style in Sedulius' works: in both the verse is clearer than the prose.<sup>48</sup> Because of these parallels and echoes of Sedulius' work in Aldhelm, we must look at the reasons which Sedulius gives for writing a *geminum opus*; although Aldhelm does not say that he is writing a *geminus stilus* version for the same reasons which Sedulius gives, he was nonetheless familiar with them and, given all the influences listed above, it would be unlikely that he ignored them.

Sedulius reveals the reasons for writing the *Opus Paschale*, which is the prose version of the *Carmen Paschale*, in a letter addressed to



his friend Macedonius:

Praecepisti...paschalis carminis textum...in rhetoricum  
me transferre sermonem, utrum quod placuerit, ideo geminari  
uolueris, an quod offenderit, ut potius arbitror, stilo  
censueris libriori describi: sub dubio uideor fluctuare  
iudicio.<sup>49</sup>

Apparently Macedonius does not indicate whether he was pleased with the *Carmen*, or whether it had offended him. But why should it offend? Sedulius suggests that the *metricae necessitatis angustia*<sup>50</sup> forced him to say things which he could say differently in a *stilo...libriori*, i.e., in prose. Gaston Boissier interprets these lines as follows:

Macedonius, qui était un théologien scrupuleux,  
dût être alarmé de voir qu'un homme qui s'appelaient lui-  
même un conscrit et un ignorant eût osé toucher à des  
matières si délicates, et (ce qui ajoutait à ses inquiétudes)  
qu'il les eût traitées en vers. N'était-il pas à craindre  
que les nécessités de la versification n'eussent forcé  
quelquefois le poète à trop resserrer ses développements et  
à omettre des choses essentielles?<sup>51</sup>

I do not think that Macedonius would have been unduly alarmed at Sedulius' calling himself a "freshman and an ignoramus." He surely recognized and accepted this as a modesty topos. The charge present in the second sentence, however, is more serious, and one which Sedulius himself seems to have recognized. Even though he maintains that the prose and verse will not differ "argumento uel ordine" but "stilo...et oratione," he nonetheless concedes that he has omitted "essential material" in the first version and that he wishes to add it in the prose: "quae defuerant primis," he says, "addita sunt secundis."<sup>52</sup> His prose does, in fact, contain material which is not found in the poetry. Sedulius inserts biblical quotations in the prose which are not in the verse or which are only alluded to. Presumably he does this because the prose can remain faithful to the words of the bible and hence remove him from the "dubio iudicio" under which he found himself after he had completed the *Carmen*.<sup>53</sup> Even though Aldhelm, Bede, and Alcuin do not claim that they write *gemina opera* in order to avoid accusation of heresy, they definitely know of this fear of Sedulius', and at least Aldhelm is greatly influenced by this writer. The wish to avoid distorting the biblical words must therefore count at least as one possible reason for the writing of the *geminus stilus* works.

The second major influence on Aldhelm appears to be Prosper of Aquitaine, who transposed Augustine's *sententiae* into epigrams. Towards the end of the *Prosa de Virginitate* and just before he announces his decision to write a poem on virginity, Aldhelm quotes two of Prosper's

epigrams along with Augustine's *sententiae*.<sup>54</sup> Although Aldhelm does not expressly say that he will write a *Carmen* in imitation of Prosper's work, several points suggest that he did. There is, first of all, the proximity between the quotation of Prosper's verses and the statement of Aldhelm's intention to do the same thing - only one page separates the two. Coincidence, maybe. But there is also a verbal echo between the passage in the prose which leads up to Prosper's verses and the passage in the *Carmen* in which Aldhelm introduces his own versification. In the prose he says: "quod Prosper per cola et commata mellitis versum epigrammatibus indulcavit,"<sup>55</sup> and in the verse:

En promissa novo scribantur carmina versu!  
Garrula virgineas depromat pagina laudes  
Colaue cum pedibus pergant et commata ternis.<sup>56</sup>

And finally: Aldhelm's lines "Nunc igitur raros decerpant carmina flores,/E quis virgineas fabricare coronas"<sup>57</sup> seem to echo Prosper's:

Dum sacris mentem placet exercere loquelis,  
Coelestique animum pascere pane iuvat:  
Quosdam, ceu prato, libuit decerpere flores,  
Distinctisque ipsos texere versiculis.<sup>58</sup>

These four lines also give us Prosper's reason for versifying the *sententiae*. Augustine's prose, as the simile suggests, is exercise for the mind and heavenly bread for the soul; the verses, on the other hand, are the flowers which are woven together, presumably to form some kind of wreath or crown. This would mean that the prose represents the "utile" while the verse represents the "iucundum."<sup>59</sup>

The two most important influences on Aldhelm, as far as writing in the *geminus stilus* is concerned, do not, as we have seen, give the interchangeability of prose and verse as their reasons for writing the *gemina opera*. Sedulius seems to fear that his verse strays too far from the actual works of the bible, and Prosper seems to be interested in the charm which verse can give to prose. Like the Anglo-Latin writers who were to follow them, they stress the differences between prose and verse, and not the similarities.

The influences on Bede and Alcuin need not be traced in the same detail as those on Aldhelm. Firstly, Bede and Alcuin place a greater emphasis on the "simplification" of the difficult verse than Aldhelm does; secondly, Bede knew Aldhelm's work and Alcuin knew Bede's.<sup>60</sup> The later writers are therefore familiar with the reasons given by the earlier ones. And finally, both Alcuin and Bede knew most of the earlier *geminus stilus* writers first hand.<sup>61</sup> A discussion of the influences on these two Anglo-Latin authors would therefore be largely



repetitive, and will not be undertaken here.

The last major area which may answer our question why Aldhelm, Bede, and Alcuin wrote in the *geminus stilus* is the use to which the *gemina opera* were put. Only Alcuin states explicitly that his prose would be read publicly to the brothers in the church while the verse should be reserved for the scrutiny of the students. Gerould comments on the fact that the reading of saint's legends formed part "of the service at nocturns" and that they were read "in place of sermons or as an addition to sermons."<sup>62</sup> Alcuin's suggestion to have the prose read in church is thus not unusual, and does not need to be examined here. Comments, are, however, necessary on the use of the *geminus stilus* works in the classroom.

Unlike Alcuin, Bede and Aldhelm do not recommend that their verse be read by students, but it appears that their texts formed part of the curriculum anyway. Ehwald says about the *De Virginitate*: "Diligenter in monasteriorum scholis lectitatus et in usu scholastico usurpatus sit Aldhelmus."<sup>63</sup> Robinson suggests that "there is good reason for assuming that they [Bede's Lives of St. Cuthbert] were [used as school texts]...Bede's *Vitae* treat a single subject in parallel prose and poetic versions, thus offering the student exercise in both forms of expression."<sup>64</sup> Both Ehwald and Robinson base their arguments on the presence of lexical and syntactical glosses in manuscripts containing Bede's and Aldhelm's works.

Schooling in the late Roman Antiquity recommended the paraphrase of poetic texts. Quintilian suggests the paraphrase as a useful exercise for orators,<sup>65</sup> and St. Augustine mentions in his *Confessiones* that he was forced to translate the texts of pagan poets into prose.<sup>66</sup> The *gemina opera* of the Anglo-Latin period seem to offer excellent models for such a paraphrase: the students can see how such eminent writers as Aldhelm, Bede, and Alcuin translate verse into prose and vice versa. Glosses in manuscripts, which amount to a prose rendition of the verse lemmata, indicate that Anglo-Saxon students were indeed expected to paraphrase poetic texts.<sup>67</sup> The prose paraphrases of the Benedictine hymns in MSS Cotton Julius A vi and Cotton Veaspasian D xii reinforce this impression:<sup>68</sup> on the one hand they helped the Anglo-Saxon students to disentangle the complicated syntax of the verse, on the other they served as models and as a possible correction for students who tried to paraphrase the hymns themselves. It is, therefore, tempting to assume that the *gemina opera* were written for the

purpose of showing students how to write a good paraphrase, especially since Aldhelm, Bede, and Alcuin are not only writers but also teachers, as their didactic works show.

This temptation must be resisted, though. Alcuin's directive that the prose be read in the church and the verse in the "secret chamber" stands opposed to the theory that both were read in the school and were used to show the interchangeability of prose and verse. Moreover, the manuscript evidence also seems to contradict such a theory.

Ehwald lists twenty-one manuscripts containing Aldhelm's prose, and twenty containing his verse;<sup>69</sup> not one of these forty-one manuscripts contains both the poem and the prose. This is surprising because Aldhelm considers the prose and verse one work and not two.<sup>70</sup> I have had access to three manuscripts<sup>71</sup> which contain the poem and not one has any glosses which would clarify the anomaly that Aldhelm mentions "*prosam metrumque*" while the manuscript contains only the "*metrum*"; I have examined eleven manuscripts which contain the prose<sup>72</sup> and there are no glosses which refer to the *Carmen*. The fact that both works are never bound together and the lack of glosses referring from the *Carmen* to the *Prosa* and vice versa suggest that Aldhelm's *geminus stilus* work was not used to demonstrate how verse could be paraphrased in prose or prose in verse.

There are at least five manuscripts<sup>73</sup> written prior to the twelfth century which contain both prose and verse *Vitae* by Bede, and therefore they may have been used to demonstrate the interchangeability of prose and verse. However, despite the fact that these manuscripts contain both versions, only one has Old English glosses on both,<sup>74</sup> while three of them have Old English glosses only on the verse and not on the prose.<sup>75</sup> The Anglo-Saxon students seem to have needed more help with the verse than with the prose (this is consistent with both Bede's and Alcuin's statements quoted above);<sup>76</sup> and it may also mean that the Anglo-Saxons concentrated more on Bede's verse than on his prose.<sup>77</sup>

Just the opposite appears to be the case with Alcuin's work. Duemmler says: "*Cum vitae Willibrordi posterior tantum libellus [=carmen] ad nostrum propositum pertineat, eum in libris manuscriptis saepius praetermissum esse, scribis insipientibus crimini dandum ac maxime dolendum est.*"<sup>78</sup> Duemmler is a bit harsh with the scribes who probably omitted the second book, not because they were ignorant, but because they wished to or had to transcribe only the text which was designed for reading in church. Of the ten<sup>79</sup> extant manuscripts prior



to the twelfth century, four (and not three as in Duemmler) contain both the verse and the prose.<sup>80</sup> Six manuscripts are therefore not equipped to demonstrate the interchangeability of prose and verse, and this evidence makes the assumption that the remaining four were used in this manner questionable.

All the evidence which I have considered so far, namely, the reasons Aldhelm, Bede, Alcuin, and the writers preceding them give for the duplication of their works; the differences in content and structure between the prose and verse; and the manuscripts containing either or both versions indicates that the *gemina opera* were not primarily designed to demonstrate that "the same subject could be treated in prose or verse without materially altering the sense" - even though, of course, they do this to a certain extent. Why then do we have Anglo Latin *geminus stilus* works?

The answer for this question seems to lie in the rhetorical tradition in which the *gemina opera* were composed. There can be little doubt that Aldhelm, Bede, and Alcuin followed the footsteps of the great Christian writers such as Prudentius, Juvencus, Arator, and the others mentioned above.<sup>81</sup> Strunk<sup>82</sup> and Klopsch<sup>83</sup> outline the dilemma from which these early Christian writers suffered. On the one hand, the book on which their faith was founded was written in a simple style, in so simple a style that the pagans seem to have mocked it. Moreover, the fellow Christians whom these authors addressed came primarily from the lower and less educated classes. Imitation of the language of the bible and the desire to be understood by one's fellow Christians demanded a "low" style. On the other hand, most early Christian writers had been educated in the pagan schools or at least knew of the rhetorical excellence of a Virgil or an Ovid. Moreover, if they wished to convert the snobbish pagans, they would have to place works of high literary merit beside those of the heathens. And that demanded a "high" style. The dilemma of choosing between the high and the low style was solved differently by various authors: Juvencus and Prudentius, for instance, boldly imitated Virgil<sup>84</sup> confident that the greatness of their subject gave them the required eloquence. Others, such as Sulpicius Severus, excused their lack of eloquence with a passage such as this: "Meminerint etiam, salutem saeculo non ab oratoribus, ... sed a piscatoribus praedicatam esse."<sup>85</sup> This dilemma formed part of the Christian rhetorical tradition. The Anglo-Saxons were acquainted with it and had come to terms with it, even though

the situation was slightly changed: the congregation<sup>86</sup> consisted mainly of the less educated who still required the simple style, especially since Latin was not their native tongue, but the pressure to impress the snobbish Roman pagans was no longer felt.

This pressure seems to have been replaced by another, namely to write something which would be worthy of the excellence of God. This idea was, of course, already known in pre-Anglo-Saxon times: Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*, for instance, gives us one valuable clue that this is indeed the aim that Christian orators (and writers?) had set themselves: "Porro cum laudatur deus sive de se ipso sive de operibus suis, quanta facies pulchrae ac splendidae dictionis oboritur, ei qui potest quantum potest laudare, quem nemo convenienter laudat, nemo quomodocumque non laudat."<sup>87</sup> Augustine here argues that anyone who praises God to the best of his ability will obtain the necessary beauty of diction, but he also adds: "nemo [deum] convenienter laudat."<sup>88</sup> This statement becomes a challenge for any writer to try his best. The Anglo-Latin writer was, therefore, in a dilemma similar to that of his Roman predecessors: in order to be understood by the congregation the style had to be simple; in order to praise God the style had to be as sophisticated as it could be. I am not proposing that the high style necessarily is verse nor that the low style necessarily is prose. We can see in Aldhelm that the prose can be very sophisticated and that the verse can be relatively simple. I am here only interested in the dichotomy of "high" and "low" style, which seems to be paralleled in the use of prose and verse.

The ideal solution for this dilemma was the *geminus stilus*: by writing both, the "high" and the "low" style, the author sacrificed neither clarity nor beauty, but simply separated them. By insisting, as Aldhelm does, that both the verse and the prose form one work, he re-combined them. The conclusion to be drawn from this is not that the *gemina opera* were written to exemplify "the interchangeability of metrical and non-metrical discourse," but that the prose was written to complement the verse and the verse was written to complement the prose.

Evidence for this view that the two styles are indeed complementary is not difficult to find. Sedulius, for instance, says: "aliud namque est mutare composita et aliud integrare non plena," and his sentence "quae defuerunt primis addita sunt secundis"<sup>89</sup> indicates that he is indeed intent on "integrare non plena." Aldhelm's image of



the walls of the prose and the roof of the poetry also suggests complementariness rather than interchangeability; and both Bede's and Alcuin's concern for the unsophisticated audience points to their desire to sacrifice neither clarity nor sophistication, but to emphasize the first in the prose and the second in the verse.

Since this pattern of two books, one of which complements the other, is so basic to Christianity with its Old and New Testament, I wonder whether it has contributed to the writing of the *geminus stilus*. Of course, the Old and New Testaments differ in content, whereas the *gemma opera* do so only to a limited extent. This objection can be countered in part, because, as typology informs us, the content of the Old Testament is often made parallel to that of the New Testament.<sup>90</sup> Moreover, speaking about the Old and New Testaments, Aldhelm uses the words "geminarum famina legum" (v.1641) where the word "geminarum" is perhaps deliberately chosen to echo the "opus...geminum." In the absence of any clearer evidence, the duality of Old and New Testament as an influence on the *geminus stilus* works must remain a speculation. It may, however, be worth pursuing.

One final speculation: scholars have long puzzled over Aelfric's rhythmic prose<sup>91</sup> to the extent that some have published his saint's lives as though they were prose<sup>92</sup> and others as though they were poetry.<sup>93</sup> They clearly are both, but enmeshed to such an extent that they cannot be separated. Perhaps Aelfric brings the *geminus stilus* to its logical conclusion in these works: rather than two works on the same subject, one in verse and one in prose, he writes only one in which he combines both styles.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Hrabanus Maurus, *De Laudibus Sanctae Crucis*, PL 107: 265. "It was a custom among the ancients to compose their works in a twofold style, so that their works would be more pleasing and more useful to their readers. Hence many are found both among secular and ecclesiastical writers who wrote on one and the same subject in metre and prose. What else did Prosper and that venerable man Sedulius do, not to mention any others?...Following their example...I, too, though the most worthless of men, have taken pains to translate the metrical version in praise of the holy cross into prose."

<sup>2</sup>Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii *Philosophiae Consolatio*, ed. L. Bieler, CCSL 94 (Turnhout, 1957). For a comment on the term "prosimetrum" see E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask, Bollingen Series 36 (Princeton, 1973), p. 151.

<sup>3</sup>Aucassin et Nicolette: *chante-fable du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, ed. Mario Roques, Les classiques français du moyen âge, 41 (Paris, 1936).

<sup>4</sup>In writing a *geminus stilus* version of the *De Laudibus Sanctae Crucis*, Hrabanus may have wished to follow Alcuin's double version of the *Vita S. Willibrordi*. The close connection between these two men is documented by the *Intercessio Albini pro Mauro* which is prefixed to the *De Laudibus S. C.* (see PL 107: 137).

<sup>5</sup>The Latin writers of Anglo-Saxon England are here called Anglo-Latin writers. The term as used in this paper does not include Latin writers of a later period of English history.

<sup>6</sup>Aldhelm, *De Virginitate*, ed. R. Ehwald, MGH Auct. Ant. 15 (Berlin, 1919); prose pp. 228-323; poetry pp. 350-471.

<sup>7</sup>Bede's prose Life is found in B. Colgrave, ed. *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert: A Life by an Anonymous Monk of Lindisfarne and Bede's Prose Life* (Cambridge, 1939; New York, 1969), pp. 141-307. The verse life is edited by W. Jaager, *Bede's metrische Vita Sancti Cuthberti*, Palaestra 198 (1935).

<sup>8</sup>Bede, *Beati Felicis Confessoris Vita*, PL 94: 789-98.

<sup>9</sup>Alcuin, *Vita Sancti Willibrordi*; poem: ed. E. Duemmler, MGH Poet. Lat. 1 (Berlin, 1881): 208-20. Prose: ed. W. Levison, MGH SRM. 7 (Hannover and Leipzig, 1920): 81-141.

<sup>10</sup>*Sancti Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani Carmina*, ed. W. V. Hartel, CSEL 30:2 (Vienna, 1894); the major poems on Felix are on pp. 42-81.



- <sup>11</sup>B. Colgrave, "The Earliest Saints' Lives Written in England," PBA 44 (1958), esp. pp. 45-49.
- <sup>12</sup>Curtius, pp. 147-48.
- <sup>13</sup>P. Klopsch, "Prosa und Vers in der mittellateinischen Literatur," MJ 3 (1966): 9-24.
- <sup>14</sup>G. Strunk, *Kunst und Glaube in der lateinischen Heiligenlegende: Zu ihrem Selbstverständnis in den Prologen*, Medium Aevum: Philologische Studien, 12 (Munich, 1970).
- <sup>15</sup>Curtis, p. 147.
- <sup>16</sup>Curtius, p. 148.
- <sup>17</sup>Klopsch, p. 10: "Aus der Erbmasse der antiken Literaturtheroie sind dem Mittelalter zwei Anschauungen über das Verhältnis von Prosa und Vers zugekommen: Erstens die, dass die Poesie zeitlich älter sei und im Wert höher stehe als die ungebundene Rede, zweitens, dass gebundene und ungebundene Rede beliebig miteinander vertauschbar seien."
- <sup>18</sup>Strunk, p. 35.
- <sup>19</sup>Colgrave, "The Earliest Saints' Lives," p. 46. See also his note on p. 514 f. in his edition of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford, 1969), where he uses almost the same words.
- <sup>20</sup>See n. 11.
- <sup>21</sup>Colgrave, "The Earliest Saints' Lives," p. 46.
- <sup>22</sup>Curtius, p. 148.
- <sup>23</sup>Aldhelm, *De Virginitate*, ed. Ewald, p. 321: "The rhetorical foundation stones were now laid and the walls of prose were built, so I shall - trusting in heavenly support - build a sturdy roof with trochaic slates and dactylic tiles of metre," trans. M. Lapidge in: M. Lapidge and M. Herren, trans., *Aldhelm: The Prose Works* (Cambridge, 1979), p. 131.
- <sup>24</sup>Ibid.: "The elegance of metrical beauty and the eloquence of rhetorical disquisition differ as much from each other as sweet new wine is different from heady mead."
- <sup>25</sup>Aldhelm, MGH Auct. Ant., 15: 352-53, lines 10-19: "You take away darkness by means of twin heavenly bodies: for Titan lights up the day and Cynthia the night; you adorn the watery plains with fat fish, you create scaly schools in the gleaming sea. In the same manner you fill the transparent air with swiftly flying bands who whistle garrulous songs with their beaks and praise the creator with manifold voice: Give me help, o gentle loving Lord, so that I can now sing in a poem the famous deeds of the saints of former times, just as previously my work has praised the chaste ones in prose."

<sup>26</sup>Aldhelm, MGH Auct. Ant., 15: 469, lines 2867-70: "Now in the end I ask all the readers of the prose and verse to show favour to this two-fold work which happens to be written down in separate books, when they peruse it with their open eyes."

<sup>27</sup>*Geminus, geminatus, and gemellus* appear twenty times in the *Carmen de Virginitate* (lines 10, 254, 318, 321/22, 715, 763, 831, 959, 1077/78, 1097, 1211, 1354, 1641, 1876, 2271, 2279, 2357, 2661, 2870); Aldhelm uses the singular only four times (lines 10, 831, 1211, 2870).

<sup>28</sup>Jaager, p. 57. "In another work I hope to write down for posterity some of the deeds which I have here omitted."

<sup>29</sup>Colgrave, *Two Lives*, pp. 146-47: "I promised that I would write more fully on another occasion about his life and miracles, and in the present work I am striving to fulfil that same promise."

<sup>30</sup>Isidore of Seville, *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*, ed. W. M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911), 1:38.

<sup>31</sup>PL 94: 786b. "They are manageable more to readers learned in prosody than to the simple sort; it has [therefore] pleased me, for the utility of the majority, to make evident the same life of the holy confessor in plainer discourse, and to imitate the industry of him who translated the martyrdom of blessed Cassian from the metrical work of Prudentius into discourse common and plain to all." (Translation from W. F. Bolton, *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature* 597-1066, 1: 597-740 [Princeton, 1967], p. 135).

<sup>32</sup>The "people" here refers to the monks and the clergy, since they were most likely the only ones to understand Latin.

<sup>33</sup>Alcuin, MGH SRM 7: 113. "I have written two little books: the first walks in prosaic words, which can be read publicly to the brothers in the church...the second runs swiftly on Pierian feet and ought to be mulled over in a secret chamber only by your students."

<sup>34</sup>Alcuin, MGH Poet. Lat., 1: 209, lines 15-18. "Holy Father, I humbly carry into your temples these two small coins of different weight. The first one retains the imprint in plain figures, while the second reflects the forms of the Muses."

<sup>35</sup>Compare, for instance, Aldhelm, lines 248-82 of the poem with pp. 249-50 of the prose. Bolton juxtaposes two passages from Bede on p. 137.

<sup>36</sup>See the notes in Ewald which collate the chapters of the prose with the lines of the verse.

<sup>37</sup>Aldhelm and Alcuin write the prose work first and then turn it into verse; Bede turns either pre-existing verse (*Vita S. Felicis*) or verse written by him (*Vita S. Cuthberti*) into prose.

<sup>38</sup>Curtius, p. 148. The editions for these authors are: Arator, CSEL 72; Dracontius, MGH Auct. Ant., 23-113, Avitus, MGH Auct. Ant., 6.2: 201-94; Juvencus, CSEL 24; Sedulius, CSEL 10.



<sup>39</sup>The editions for these authors are: Paulinus of Perigueux, CSEL 16; Venantius Fortunatus, MGH Auct. Ant., 4: 1; Sulpicius Severus, CSEL 1.

<sup>40</sup>Prosper of Aquitaine, *Epigrammatum ex Sententiis S. Augustini Liber*, PL 51: 497-532.

<sup>41</sup>S. Hieronymus, *Epistola ad Eustochium*, PL 22: 409: "et Papae Damasi super hac re [=de virginitate] versu, prosaque composita."

<sup>42</sup>See above, n. 31.

<sup>43</sup>Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969), p. 514. "He also wrote a most excellent book on virginity both in hexameter verse and in prose, producing a twofold work after the example of Sedulius" (p. 515).

<sup>44</sup>See the notes in Ehwald, *passim*.

<sup>45</sup>These quotations appear on pp. 232, 249, 250, and 284.

<sup>46</sup>The Old Testament miracles end at line 290 of book 1 of the *Carmen*, and with chapter 28 of book 1 of the prose.

<sup>47</sup>Aldhelm has completed the enumeration of Old Testament virgins at line 390 of the *Carmen*, and at the end of Ch. 21 in the prose.

<sup>48</sup>With this statement I do not wish to contradict Michael Winterbottom's findings in "Aldhelm's Prose Style and Its Origins" in ASE 6 (1977): 39-76. There is, however, a marked parallel in that the poetry is easier to read than the prose. See also G. Boissier, "Le Carmen Paschale et L'Opus Paschale de Sedulius," *Revue de Philologie N. S.* 6 (1882): 30: Ainsi, il est vrai qu'à ce moment la langue de la prose était beaucoup moins simple, moins correcte, plus corrompue que celle des vers." And: "Les vers sont beaucoup plus simple et plus aisés à comprendre que la prose." (p. 29).

<sup>49</sup>Sedulius, CSEL 10: 171. "You have commanded me to translate the text of the *Carmen Paschale* into prose. I am plagued by doubts as to whether you wished to see the work written in a twofold style because it has please you, or whether you have decided to have it written in a freer style because it has offended you, as I am inclined to suspect."

<sup>50</sup>Sedulius, CSEL 10: 172.

<sup>51</sup>Boissier, p. 28.

<sup>52</sup>Sedulius, CSEL 10: 173.

<sup>53</sup>Compare, for instance, book 2, chapter 7 of the prose with lines 73-88 of book 2 of the poem.

<sup>54</sup>Aldhelm, ed. Ehwald, pp. 318-19.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., p. 319: "which Prosper made sweet in the honeyed epigrams of his verses, using half-verse and caesuras."

<sup>56</sup>"Lo, let the promised songs be written in new verse, let the garrulous page sing the praise of the virgins, and let the caesuras and the half-verses with their three feet issue forth."

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., p. 358, lines 138-39: "Now let our songs pick rare flowers from which they may fashion crowns for the virgins."

<sup>58</sup>PL 51: 497-98. "As long as it was pleasing to exercise the mind with holy sayings, and as long as we took delight in feeding the heart with heavenly bread, it pleased us to pick some flowers, as if from a meadow, and to weave them together in separate verses."

<sup>59</sup>Cf. Hrabanus' introduction to his prose *De Laudibus Sanctae Crucis*. See n. 1.

<sup>60</sup>For Alcuin's knowledge of Bede's *Vita S. Cuthberti* see lines 684-86 of the *Versus de Sanctis Eboricensis Ecclesiae*, MGH Poet. Lat., 1: 184:

Omnia quae dudum praeclarus Beda sacerdos  
Prosaice prium scripsit sermone magister,  
Et post heroico cecinit miracula versu.

<sup>61</sup>On books which were known to the Anglo-Saxons, see J. D. A. Ogilvy, *Books Known to the English*, 597-1066, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, Mass., 1967); for influences especially on Bede and Aldhelm see M. Manitius, "Zu Aldhelm und Beda," *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 122 (Wien, 1886): 535-634.

<sup>62</sup>G. Gerould, *Saints' Legends* (Boston, 1916), p. 14.

<sup>63</sup>MGH Auct. Ant. 15: 215.

<sup>64</sup>F. C. Robinson, "Syntactical Glosses in Latin Manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Provenance," *Speculum* 48 (1973): 463. See also M. Lapidge, "The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature," ASE 4 (1975): 75, on the use of Aldhelm in the classroom.

<sup>65</sup>Quintilian's *Institutes of Oratory or Education of an Orator*, trans. J. S. Watson (London, 1902), p. 293: "But the conversion of Latin writing into other words will also be of great service to us. About the utility of turning poetry into prose, I suppose that no one has any doubt." (=I. O. 10.5.4).

<sup>66</sup>*The Confessions of St. Augustine*, ed. J. G. Gibb and W. Montgomery (Cambridge, 1927), 1: 17: "sed figmentorum poeticorum uestigia errantes sequi cogebamur et tale aliquid dicere solutis uerbis, quale poeta dixisset uersibus."

<sup>67</sup>See G. Wieland, *The Latin Glosses on Arator and Prudentius in University Library*, Cambridge, MS Gg. 5.35, Diss. (Toronto, 1976), esp. pp. 316-18.

<sup>68</sup>Edited by H. Gneuss, *Hymnar und Hymnen im englischen Mittelalter*, Buchreihe der Anglia: Zeitschrift für englische Philologie, 12 (Tübingen, 1968): 261-413.



- <sup>69</sup>MGH Auct. Ant., 15: 225 for the prose and p. 349 for the verse.
- <sup>70</sup>See Aldhelm's text above and n. 26 of this paper; he says "hoc opus" and not "haec opera."
- <sup>71</sup>There are CCCC MS 285; Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Rawlinson C 697; Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 577 (27645).
- <sup>72</sup>These manuscripts are: BL MS Royal 5E xi; BL MS Royal 6A vi; BL MS Royal 6B vii; BL MS Royal 7D xxiv; BL MS Harley 3013; Bodleian Library, MS Digby 146 (19747); Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 97 (1928); Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 49 (1946); Salisbury Cathedral MS 38; CCCC MS 326; Hereford Cathedral MS P.I.xvii.
- <sup>73</sup>These manuscripts are: BL Cotton Vitellius A xix; BL Harley 1117; Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 109 (1962); CCCC 183; Bodleian Library, MS Digby 175 (1776).
- <sup>74</sup>Namely, MS BL Cotton Vitellius A xix.
- <sup>75</sup>All of those mentioned in n. 73 except MS Digby 175 (1776).
- <sup>76</sup>See pp. 116-17.
- <sup>77</sup>Jaager, *Bedas metrische Vita sancti Cuthberti*, pp. 24-32 contains a list of manuscripts of the verse. There are ten altogether, prior to the twelfth century.
- <sup>78</sup>MGH Poet Lat. 1: 163.
- <sup>79</sup>Stuttgart, Public Library MS xiv, 1, formerly Weingarten 1630; Codex Treverensis, bibl. urb. MS 1834; Codex Monacensis Latinus n. 4605 and n. 18956; Codex Sangallensis 565; Wirziburgensis Mp. th. f. 34; Codex Parisiensis 10865 and 5294; Codex Berlinensis Lat. n. 121; Codex Alentoniensis n. 14.
- <sup>80</sup>Stuttgart, bibl. publ. xiv, 1; Codex Sangallensis 565; Wirziburgensis Mp. th. f. 34, and Codex Alentoniensis n. 14.
- <sup>81</sup>P. 119.
- <sup>82</sup>Strunk, pp. 15-26.
- <sup>83</sup>Klopsch, pp. 11-13.
- <sup>84</sup>For Juvenius, see lines 9-35 of the *Evangeliorum Libri Quattuor*; and for Prudentius see his *Psychomachia* with its Vergilian echoes.
- <sup>85</sup>Sulpicius Severus, CSEL 1: 109.
- <sup>86</sup>See n. 32.
- <sup>87</sup>St. Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, 4.19.38: "Again, when God is praised either on His own account or because of his works, what an appearance of beautiful and splendid diction arises in him who praises Him as he is able, whom no one praises adequately and whom no one in one way or another fails to praise." (Translation from St.

Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, The Library of Liberal Arts, trans. D. W. Robertson Jr., [Indianapolis, 1958], p. 146; Cf. CSEL 80: 146.)

<sup>88</sup>For English monastic circles the "best" was probably imitation of the works of the early Christian writers, the Psalms, and the hymns, some of which are metrical saints' lives.

<sup>89</sup>CSEL 10: 172-73.

<sup>90</sup>Thus Christ is the "second Adam"; Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac corresponds to God the Father's of His Son. See E. Auerbach, "Figura," *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature* (New York, 1959).

<sup>91</sup>E.g., M. McC. Gatch, *Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England: Aelfric and Wulfstan* (Toronto, 1977), p. 15. "This [Aelfric's] style is thought by some to be imitative of late Latin rhymed prose; but in general, efforts to find stylistic sources for Aelfric's work have failed to perceive its real genius."

<sup>92</sup>Aelfric, *Lives of Three English Saints*, ed. G. I. Needham (London, 1966).

<sup>93</sup>E.g., *Aelfric's Lives of Saints*, EETS 76, 82, 94, 114, ed. W. M. Skeat (London, 1881).



ALCUIN'S GRAMMAR VERSE: POETRY AND TRUTH IN CAROLINGIAN PEDAGOGY

Colin Chase

University of Toronto

In recent years, a marked tendency towards deductive analysis has characterized Alcuinian studies. The purpose of the deduction has been to abstract from Alcuin's work a systematic treatment of areas of human thought which he dealt with only implicitly or casually. Thus, in 1959, Luitpold Wallach in *Alcuin and Charlemagne*<sup>1</sup> outlined a political philosophy based on his analysis of the *Dialogus de Rhetorica et Virtutibus*, though Alcuin purported to be treating only the subject implied by his title, that is, the essential nature and manner of acquisition of the art of rhetoric and the four cardinal virtues. Again, in 1965, Wolfgang Edelstein in *Eruditio und Sapientia* concentrated on the letters in order to deduce a sociology for Alcuin and his period.<sup>2</sup> Finally, in 1978, W. F. Bolton in *Alcuin and Beowulf* compiled references, drawn from the whole corpus, but principally from the exegetical commentary, the *didascalia*, and the polemical writing, to construct a theory of literary criticism according to which Alcuin might have read *Beowulf*.<sup>3</sup>

The deductive character of these investigations does not invalidate them. Although Edelstein's methodology would have been foreign to Alcuin or anybody of his time, in my opinion, the conclusions drawn are thoroughly consonant with the period, for the author carefully and consistently distinguishes between attitudes implicit in his analytic method and attitudes which might conceivably have belonged to the Carolingians themselves. Thus, there is no implication in Edelstein's study that Charlemagne and his court would have been any more interested than the Hatfields and the McCoy's in the excitements of sociological analysis.

*Insular Latin Studies*, ed. Michael Herren,  
Papers in Mediaeval Studies 1 (Toronto:  
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981)  
pp. 135-152



The same, regrettably, cannot be said for the others: the very statement that Alcuin had a political theory or a theory of literary criticism which might be applied to secular vernacular verse involves presuppositions respecting the uses of power and the enjoyment of beauty in Carolingian Europe which I suspect are largely anachronistic. The process of deductive analysis, in these instances, devolves into a search for hints and fragments to satisfy the intellectual curiosities of our own time and not to discover Alcuin's.

For the literary scholar this turn of events is alarming. When the solid sober *Wissenschaft* of our more learned cousins in history and the social sciences becomes tinged with this kind of subjectivity, what is to become of us? "If they do these things in the green wood, what will they do in the dry?" For many years now, we in literature have existed comfortably enough with an approach to Alcuin's poetry which, if not wholly modern, is at least Victorian in outline. We have anthologized, translated, and commented frequently upon four poems: the "Farewell to His Cell," the "Elegy for a Nightingale," the "Debate Between Winter and Spring," and the "Epitaph," despite a nagging doubt that the first (possibly), the third (probably), and the last, (given the circumstances), are likely not to have been written by Alcuin at all.<sup>4</sup> Beyond these four, we generally acknowledge the importance of the poem on the church at York - particularly with reference to its list of authors represented in the library there -, the versified life of Willibrord, and the poem on the destruction of Lindisfarne, not because they are to be admired as literature, but because they relate to Alcuin's biography, to the intellectual life of the times, to its missionary activity, and to the history of the Viking invasions.<sup>5</sup> Such reasons are excellent, but they do not put us in touch with Alcuin's sense of what he was about in the composition of poetry. Such reasons also explain why we more often know about these poems than read them.

But even when we discuss the poems we read and reread, there is an inescapable impression that we read them with concerns and pre-occupations more appropriate to our modern than their medieval setting. For example, Peter Dale Scott in an article of 1964 entitled "Alcuin as a Poet: Rhetoric and Belief in his Latin verse," applies a subtle intellect and a sensitive ear to appreciating principally the "Farewell to His Cell" and the "Elegy for a Nightingale."<sup>6</sup> Beginning with the hypothesis that at given periods in history style becomes fixed and ceases to express interior attitudes, Scott goes on to describe the

character of his interest in Alcuin's poetry:

To harmonize our inner and outer habitations, a readjustment of rhetoric and belief is called for. This occurred, for example, during the Romantic Revival, and many have called for it in our time. I propose to study Alcuin, not just as a poet in his own right, but as an example of such a readjustment. In his age as in our own, language, the great conservative medium of a culture (in which all is convention and only the habitual survives) had become a problematic and challenging link with a largely alienated past.<sup>7</sup>

The comparison is tempting. Just as Wordsworth in the preface to the second (1800) edition of *The Lyrical Ballads* had called for a return to "the very language of men" and for greater freedom and simplicity in poetic language, Alcuin demonstrably wrote poetry in which he "effectively censored out the rhetorical overworking, the penchant for the *antheron plasma* or flowery style" which characterized so much of the poetry in the tradition he inherited.<sup>8</sup> The comparison, as I say, is tempting, until one recollects the basic facts of Alcuin's linguistic context. Alcuin wrote Latin verse. During his life he lived successively at York, Aachen, and Tours, where "the language of men" was Old English, Frankish, and an Italic dialect no longer recognizable as Latin. In fact, less than a decade after Alcuin's death at Tours, a council meeting at that place decreed that bishops were to translate their homilies into *rustica Romana lingua* or into Germanic so they could be understood.<sup>9</sup> In such an historical and linguistic context, the comparison with England of the Romantic Revival becomes equivocal, for while the romantics were declaring their independence of both tradition and the classroom, Alcuin's clarity and simplicity were part of a re-emphasis on both the tradition of Donatus and Priscian and the necessity for constant academic exercise to master the universal language of western Europe and the church. There is much that is valuable in Scott's article, but much of that value is vitiated by the presumption that Alcuin's attitude towards rhetorical tradition was something like Wordsworth's.

Such a romantic stance - that poetry defines itself through opposition to the traditions and culture of its own society - influences not only the poems we select to read and the way we describe their historical context but also the way we understand those poems. Myra Uhlfelder's 1975 article on the *Farewell to His Cell* is a good example.<sup>10</sup> In this description of the poem's strategy, the poet "is led astray by the gloomy thoughts and feelings induced by preoccupation with this world, until his very excess and intensity - his explicit rejection of



belief in stability and permanent values - appear to shock him into renewed awareness and affirmation of his Christian faith. Finding himself, he returns to the Way and the Life."<sup>11</sup> In this reading, the poet's absorption with the vanity and evanescence of life represents a kind of nihilism, expressed most completely in the couplet:

Nil manet aeternum, nihil immutabile vere est  
Obscurat sacrum nox tenebrosa diem. (25-26)

This gives way finally to a reaffirmation of faith in God, "Pectore quem pariter toto laudamus, amemus," not by a linear extension of the process of reflection, but by a reversal stimulated by the sudden realization that he has wandered so far from the paths of faith. This is much like Keats' realization in the famous nightingale ode, where - enchanted and "half in love with easeful Death" from listening to the bird's song - the poet is similarly recalled by a sudden thought:

Forlorn! the very word is like a bell  
To toll me back from thee to my sole self!  
Adieu! the fancy cannot cheat so well  
As she is fabled to do, deceiving elf. (71-4)

In both Keats' ode and in Myra Uhlfelder's interpretation of the "Versus ad Cellam," poetry is an inevitable tension with the traditional values of culture. It is a siren sound, inviting the poet to a thrilling but potentially dangerous encounter with mysterious and irrational forces. This interpretation expresses clearly and forcefully the sort of value our generation has looked for in its verse. Such values are, in my view, wholly contrary not only to the ordinary attitudes of the time, but also to Alcuin's explicitly enunciated goals and aspirations. The identification of some of those central, controlling aspirations is a primary objective of this paper.

My premise, then, is that we can better understand not only the mind of Alcuin but also any given product of that mind if we begin by examining work more closely related to his central preoccupations than to ours. The verse associated with his lifelong commitment to pedagogy provides a convenient expression of these preoccupations, though this verse has to be clarified with reference to the pedagogical prose works of which they are frequently a part. To call this verse "grammar poetry" may seem perverse, but the expression is an attempt to avoid distortion by using his concept rather than ours, for in Alcuin's day the classical notion that *grammatici* were *poetarum interpretes* or *explanatores* was still current.<sup>12</sup> At the same time, grammar had some of the association with the fundamentals of education it still has,

without the restrictive, pejorative connotation deriving from its later status as the first and lowest of the arts of the trivium, a word which does not appear for more than a century after Alcuin's day. In his time, while *grammatica* was considered the first of the seven liberal arts,<sup>13</sup> its cultivation was not limited to any one phase of education, but provided the basic methodology for all of them. Thus, knowledge was considered to consist in natural, moral, and rational science, called respectively *Physica*, including the arts later called the *quadrivium*; *Ethica*, including the four cardinal virtues; and *Logica*, or rational science, including rhetoric and dialectic but not grammar, for grammar was held to be a constituent element of all the sciences. Hence, the term "grammar poetry," which implies both the interpretation of poetry and the investigation of first principles.<sup>14</sup>

While this overview gives an accurate notion of the way the Carolingians conceived the different branches of learning to be related, in practical terms, most of the time was apparently spent in the last-mentioned branch, *Logica*, or rational science. Furthermore, this was accomplished at the same time as the arts of liturgical singing and calligraphy were being pursued, so that students would be sent off in groups to the chantry, the scriptorium, or to a *lectio* master, who - as I understand it - would drill them in the progressive acquisition of the liberal arts.<sup>15</sup> The poetry I am looking at relates to these day-to-day practical and pedagogical activities at which Alcuin spent his life.

A convenient example is offered by the first two lines of the versified prologue to Alcuin's *De Dialectica*:

Me lege, qui veterum cupias cognoscere sensus,  
Me quicumque capit, rusticitate caret.<sup>16</sup>

"The one that understands me is without....what? Rusticity?" Today, that might not seem a very inviting promise. A book promising to relieve its readers of rustic charm does not promise much. For Alcuin, however, *rustici*, or people from the *rus*, inhabit the same semantic category as *pagani*, or people from the *pagus* or country, or in his native Old English the *haethen* or "health-dwellers" - all of them living in darkness, all of them a little suspect and somewhat alien for reasons strikingly similar to those for which, by contrast, the early nineteenth century began to find country people and country places so charming: that is, because both the people and the places seemed very much as nature had made them. Isidore of Seville explains, "Gentiles are so



named because they remain just as they were *geniti*," which for him meant "just as in the flesh they have descended under the power of sin, serving idols and not yet *regenerati*."<sup>17</sup> The process of education was seen, then, as a process by which man in his natural state, *rudis* and *indoctus*, is brought to *eruditio* and *doctrina*. It was parallel to and partly identified with the process which brought the unbaptized to a rebirth in Christ. How different is this attitude to education from that implied in Wordsworth's "Immortality Ode," in which the uninstructed child is addressed as "Best Philosopher..."

Mighty Prophet! Seer blest!  
On whom those truths do rest  
Which we are toiling all our lives to find (110,114-16)

The contrast is not random or fortuitous. Dominated by a post-romantic sense of the function of poetry, we have chosen to read those poems of Alcuin which concern nature, natural scenery, and the relations between man and nature. We have, moreover, brought to them a post-industrialized preoccupation with the alienation of man from his natural surroundings. In both instances we have inevitably distorted Alcuin's meaning. For him, *rusticitas* was never a positive word.<sup>18</sup>

Some sense of the major concerns which do appear to have occupied Alcuin can be gained by a brief look at the short poem he appended to his *Dialogus de Rhetorica et Virtutibus*. The poem suggests what Alcuin feels to be among the chief difficulties and the chief rewards of a life of study:

O vos, est aetas, iuvenes, quibus apta legendo,  
Discite: eunt anni more fluentis aquae.  
Atque dies dociles vacuis ne perdit rebus:  
Nec redit unda fluens, nec redit hora ruens.  
Floreat in studiis virtutum prima iuventus,  
Fulgeat ut magno laudis honore senex,  
Utere, quisque legas librum, felicibus annis,  
Auctorisque memor dic: "miserere deus."  
Si nostram, lector, festucam tollere quaeris,  
Robora de proprio lumine tolle prius:  
Disce tuas, iuvenis, ut agat facundia causas,  
Ut sis defensor, cura, salusque tuis.  
Disce, precor, iuvenis, motus moresque venustos,  
Laudetur toto ut nomen in orbe tuum.<sup>19</sup>

A persistent concern apparent in this poem, as in many of Alcuin's is the swift passage of time. The fourth line, based on a couplet of Ovid's, is a favourite of Alcuin's, appearing again and again in his verse.<sup>20</sup> In the verses written apparently to dedicate the walls of a chantry, he makes a plea much like that just quoted:

Instruat in studiis iuvenum bona tempora doctor,  
Nam fugiunt anni more fluentis aquae.<sup>21</sup>  
or again in the verses added to his commentary on Ecclesiastes, he laments:

Omnia fluxa fluunt saeculorum gaudia longe  
Nec redeunt iterum more fluentis aquae.<sup>22</sup>

This preoccupation with the swift passage of time and with the mutability of human joy is not surprising in a man of this period, and certainly not in an Englishman, the poetry of whose native land is so filled with similar concern. What is, perhaps, a little disconcerting is his insistence on the topic in this particular context. His educational poems, the "grammar poetry" of my title, return to the theme with even greater regularity than the broad range of his verse. Why?

The answer, I believe, is to be found in the central passage of Alcuin's dialogue-introduction to his *De Grammatica*, in which master and student seek an answer to the age-old question: "What is true happiness?" and, "What is true wisdom?" As the dialogue proceeds, familiar ground is covered. True happiness cannot consist in anything exterior, for these cannot be securely possessed. Nor can it consist in any delight of mine which depends on such things. "Quid pulchrius luce?" says the master: "et haec tenebris succedentibus obfuscatur. Quid floribus venustius aestatis? qui tamen hiemalibus frigoribus pereunt. Quid salute corporis suavius? et quis hanc perpetuam habere confidit?... Si coelum terraque suis semper vicissitudinibus mutantur... quanto magis cujuslibet rei specialis delectatio transitoria esse necesse est?"<sup>23</sup> As the dialogue proceeds, it becomes clear that the one possession which one may keep despite external circumstances is *sapientia*. Here is the root of true happiness, for this is not subject to the same laws of change and decay as other things. At this point the dialogue begins to take a new turn, for the question of the soul's immortality is raised. To the question as to whether the soul's wisdom endures along with the soul, the master answers, "Is it not unreasonable that the soul should endure without that which makes it beautiful and worthy? Therefore it appears that both are everlasting."<sup>24</sup>

At this point the student begins to question his master about the acquisition of this wisdom, which is both perfect guarantor of happiness and not subject to change. In response, the master quotes from



the Book of Proverbs: "Wisdom built herself a house; she fashioned seven columns,"<sup>25</sup> and goes on: "Quae sententia licet ad divinam pertineat Sapientiam, quae sibi in utero virginali domum, id est corpus, aedificavit, hanc et septem donis sancti Spiritus confirmavit: vel Ecclesiam, quae est domus Dei, eisdem donis illuminavit; tamen Sapientia liberalium litterarum septem columnis confirmatur; nec aliter ad perfectam quemlibet deducit scientiam, nisi his septem columnis vel etiam gradibus exaltetur".<sup>26</sup>

Thus, in Alcuin's pedagogy, the perception that time's swift chariot carries all before it does not represent a temptation to despair nor a statement of the meaninglessness of existence but the rational principle and motive for the attainment of learning. As we have seen, Alcuin identifies progress through academic learning as a necessary condition for attaining wisdom; at the same time, such wisdom is also identified with the state of the blessed soul after death. The conclusion to be drawn is not that Alcuin had devised a sort of academic Pelagianism (his doctrine of grace was sufficiently Augustinian to protect him from that), but rather that, in his time, scholarship and ultimate truth were more closely and optimistically identified with one another than they have often been since, and, perhaps more important, that reflection on the fickle quality of human happiness in more likely to be evidence of faith than despair in Alcuin.

In the context of the poem we were considering, the references to the passage of time fulfil the same kind of function that the thoughts of earthly mutability do in the preface to the *De Grammatica*, that is, they are a spur to activity and a warning against wasteful idleness:

Atque dies dociles vacuis ne perdit rebus;  
Nec redit unda fluens, nec redit hora ruens.<sup>27</sup>

The difference is that the poem is not as explicitly concerned with the soul's eternal destiny as with praise and honour in a man's later years. The two were not unconditionally compatible with one another: in the preface to the *De Grammatica*, the master tells his student: "Est equidem facile viam vobis demonstrare sapientiae, si eam tantummodo propter Deum, propter puritatem animae, propter veritatem cognoscendam, etiam et propter seipsam diligatis; et non propter humanam laudem, vel honores saeculi, vel etiam divitiarum fallaces voluptates."<sup>28</sup> At the same time, the two were not wholly antithetical. In this poem, Alcuin both asks for prayers for his own soul, "Auctorisque memor dic: 'Miserere deus,'" and at the same time twice recommends the praise of

men, first as the reward of a wise old age, then as the natural result of virtue learned in youth. Alcuin did not see any obvious contradiction between a serious Christian commitment and a reasonable respect for the opinion of men. In the concluding section of the preface to the *De Grammatica* he notes, after naming the seven liberal arts, that with their help the philosophers became more famous than kings,<sup>29</sup> and in an epigram ascribed to him he comments on the immortality of poets:

Vivere post mortem vates vis nosse viator?  
Quod legis ecce loquor, vox tua nempe mea est.<sup>30</sup>

To me, this epigram expresses a beautiful balance between the human attraction and the ultimate fragility of earthly fame.

The references in this couplet to man as pilgrim or wayfarer points to the imaginative nucleus about which much of Alcuin's thought revolved. To him and to his contemporaries this world was seen, not only as a "faire that passeth soone as floures faire" but also as a journey home from exile, the direction and milestones for which were plotted by application to the study principally of the first three of the liberal arts, of scripture, and the fathers. These things ensured that the one thing necessary, ultimate understanding and eternal happiness, would be salvaged from the all-consuming power of time.

But to accomplish this one needs texts. Exposure to the word, both sacred and secular, would ensure the journey could be accomplished, but who was to guarantee that the word itself would survive the Heraclitean fire unscorched by time and unobscured by human ignorance or perversity? An anxious concern that man's ultimate happiness depends on such fragile, corruptible things as a good knowledge of syntax, clear articulation, a good pen, and dark ink goes far towards explaining the nagging, querulous note that whines through so many of Alcuin's letters and epistolary poems: "Whatever you may think of this page, keep it as a witness to my advice, and as often as you peruse it, recognize me speaking in your heart"; "hear the lector, not the harpist at your priestly banquet"; "have a better copy made of my letter to journey with you, to stay with you, and to speak to you in place of my paternal voice."<sup>31</sup> To the careless post-Merovingians of the 780's, Alcuin must have appeared the fussiest of curmudgeons and a champion pedant.

Something of this note can be heard in the last of the "grammar poems" to be examined. These are lines composed to adorn the walls of the scriptorium:



Hic sedeant sacrae scribes famina legis,  
 Nec non sanctorum dicta sacrata patrum;  
 Hic interserere caveant sua frivola verbis,  
 Frivola nec propter erret et ipsa manus,  
 Correctosque sibi quaerant studiose libellos,  
 Tramite quo recto penna volantis eat.  
 Per cola distinguant proprios et commata sensus,  
 Et punctos ponant ordine quosque suo,  
 Ne vel falsa legat, taceat vel forte repente  
 Ante pios fratres lector in ecclesia.  
 Est opus egregium sacros iam scribere libros,  
 Nec mercede sua scriptor et ipse caret.  
 Podere quam vites melius est scribere libros,  
 Ille suo ventri serviet, iste animae.  
 Vel nova vel vetera poterit proferre magister  
 Plurima, quisque legit dicta sacrata patrum.<sup>32</sup>

The last couplet is a reference to Matthew's text: "Every scribe learned in the kingdom of heaven is like the householder who brings forth from his treasure things both new and old."<sup>33</sup> Just as the study of grammar and the liberal arts is the necessary condition for the attainment of wisdom and lasting happiness, so the activity of the scribe is the necessary condition for study of any kind. Without the results of his demanding labour, the word becomes garbled, illegible, or unpronounceable; the reader becomes confused and either misreads or falls into silence; and the soul lacks its proper food.

During the years that Alcuin was at Aachen and Tours, there were constant pressures both in his individual life and in the atmosphere of life at Charles' court which served to give added emphasis to the importance of clarity and functional intelligibility in communication at every level, from the simplest calligraphic exercise to the most sophisticated theological analysis, for to Alcuin and his time there was an unavoidable connection between word and Word. The pressure which demanded the most time and energy for Alcuin was that generated by the Adoptionist controversy, which not only engaged him in a long and complex correspondence with Felix and Elipandus, the chief proponents of Adoptionism, but also elicited his most sustained theological effort: seven books against the arguments of Felix and four against those of Elipandus, occupying nearly two hundred columns in Migne's reprint.<sup>34</sup> While Alcuin certainly engaged the central theological issues in these works, in many ways Felix's difficulties appeared to him to derive from a faulty grasp of grammar. Alcuin advises a female correspondent, who was apparently having difficulty answering the arguments of the Adoptionists: "Tu vero de grammatica tua profer regulas naturales... Interrogandum est, quid sit medium inter verum et

non verum? Si dicit: nihil, inferendum est: ergo Christus secundum quod homo est, aut verus Deus est aut non verus. Sed valde absurdum est dicere Deum eum esse, sed non verum. Aut si hoc erubescit adversarius dicere, proferat, quid sit medium inter verum et non verum secundum artem dialecticam, interrogandum est, si una persona possit esse homo verus et homo pictus, qui est non verus homo. Si dicit, non posse, inferendum est: nec in Christo, qui est una persona, in duabus naturis verum esse potest et non verum, sed quicquid in eo est, verum est, quia ipse totus est Deus et totus verus filius Dei et tota veritas in eo est et nihil habet figmenti in se."<sup>35</sup>

In this sort of argumentation, one notices not only a strong pastoral desire to help a person who is possibly being upset by the arguments of those about her, but also an optimistic sense that even the deepest mysteries will yield their secrets if only we gain a sure enough grasp of the fundamental disciplines. As Alcuin put it at the conclusion of his preface to the *De Grammatica*, the seven liberal arts not only provide fame and happiness to philosophers, pagan or Christian, but "through them the holy and Catholic teachers and defenders of our faith have always overcome heretics in public debates."<sup>36</sup>

The argument just quoted, suggesting that one person cannot at the same time be a man and the picture of a man, is perhaps a faint reflection of the other major pressure at Charlemagne's court in Alcuin's time, emphasizing functional clarity of a verbal kind. This is the pressure of the iconoclastic controversy, for the misunderstood iconodule position was debated and condemned at the same Council of Frankfort which condemned Felix's position. Though I disagree with Professor Wallach's recently expressed opinion that Alcuin wrote the *Libri Carolini*,<sup>37</sup> there is nonetheless an interesting connection between that work and Alcuin's grammatical cast of mind. As with the Adoptionist controversy, much of the discussion, again, hinged on arguments drawn from grammar and its adjunct studies. According to the *Libri*, the iconoclastic synod of 754 had erred as badly as their iconodule children, since the earlier council had treated the species as a genus. The middle term of the argument is that, whereas all idols are images, not all images are idols: images are for ornamentation and for commemoration of the past, idols for superstitious worship.<sup>38</sup> This distinction is important, for there is evidence that such a functional definition of the uses of ecclesiastical art had some impact in the



years following, partly because the original documents from the Council of Nicaea were not translated into a more accurate Latin version until the latter part of the ninth century, leaving a lasting impression that half of Christendom had lapsed into idolatry.

For example, Ermoldus Nigellus' description of the church built by Louis IV at Ingelheim describes a severely functional, chronologically arranged sequence of scenes, detailing Old Testament history on one wall, while "Altera pars retinet Christi vitalia gesta, / Quae terris missus a genitore dedit."<sup>39</sup> If the poem is accurate, the pictorial detail is exhaustive, with a different scene suggested by nearly every four lines of the sixty-five.

A similar programme is described by the verses which are said to have been inscribed on the walls of St. Gall. In one part, possibly the entrance, there must have been a full sequence of pictures portraying the Nativity, including in order the angelic appearance of Zachary, the annunciation to Mary, the visitation, the naming of John, the angels and shepherds, the stable at Bethlehem, the coming of the Magi, the dream of Joseph, the flight into Egypt, and the slaughter of the innocents. A similarly detailed continuation of the life of Christ is said to occupy the right wall of what I understand to be the nave of the church, from the baptism of Jesus and the calling of the apostles through a long sequence from the passion, while the sequence is completed with a last judgement scene above and around the *cathedra*, featuring Gabriel's trumpets and a large shining cross above, and scenes of the blessed and damned below.<sup>40</sup>

These later developments I tentatively connect with the pressures and fears generated by the iconoclastic controversy, because they conform so well to the function of church art approved in the *Libri Carolini*, and because, to my knowledge, these decorative programmes were so different from those which characterized ecclesiastical art before this period. If I am right, this iconographical tendency springs from the same suspicion of the ill-defined and the non-functional which governed Alcuin's attitude towards pedagogy. Just as faulty grammar can lead to heresy, non-functional art can breed idolatry. The guardian against all such excess is, again, the explicit statement, clear and functional. This is true, as Hrabanus Maurus was to put it,

Plus quia gramma valet quam vana in imagine forma,  
Plusque animae decoris praestat quam falsa colorum  
Pictura ostentans rerum non rite figuras.<sup>41</sup>  
Nam scriptura pia norma est perfecta salutis.

The poem ends with a reminder that painting and the art of pigmentation first derived from Egypt, whose name means "anxious trouble" (*angustans tribulatio*) as does the art she discovered. By contrast, the Lord chose to carve the rock of the law with writing, which he entrusted to his *magister* to bring to the people. This fear and suspicion explains the impressive amount of monumental verse written by Alcuin and his successors. The word was always present to guard against idolatry.

The implications of this for poetry are extensive. When the visual icon is stripped of its power to mediate reality, the verbal icon becomes similarly caught, cabined, and put to work at the mill wheel of explicitly functional expression. Alcuin's verbal simplicity, noted by Peter Scott and discussed at the opening of this paper, is more than a simple "censoring out" of the "flowery style." It is apparently part of a rigidly functional approach to learning, art, and the most challenging mysteries of life. The verdict of most critics who read Carolingian Latin poetry is that Theodulf of Orléans is a better poet than Alcuin. I would not challenge that verdict. Though we can learn more from Alcuin about the mood and temper of his time, Theodulf's poetry is always more evocative, complex, ambiguous, and - to continue the comparison - iconic. A supreme irony of Carolingian letters is the iridescent quality of the imagery employed in the *Libri Carolini* to sustain the attack on the iconodules. In this, Theodulf - who, as Paul Meyvaert has argued, probably wrote the *Libri*<sup>42</sup> - illustrates what a complex, contradictory personality he was. As bishop of Orléans, he gave up writing poetry, partially for the reasons he gives to his friends, namely, that the responsibilities of his pastoral care did not leave him time for it.<sup>43</sup> I think it likely, also, that the plain, unvarnished style of the poetry written by Alcuin, and the even further simplified poetry by Angilbert, did not appeal to him. Certainly, when he returned to poetry in disgrace and exile, it was to the symbolic, fiercely apocalyptic style of his "Epistle to Modoin," describing the portentous drying up of a river and the war of the birds.<sup>44</sup>

As we have seen, the one area of experience which Alcuin could not reduce to the easy formulas of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric was his sense of the evanescence of all things human. Before this mystery



he was capable of standing in wonder and, for that reason, of writing poetry about it. Even in the relatively dry, formal grammar verse I have been examining, the catch in the throat can be heard, the inescapable fear of our universal grave:

Nec bene namque senex poeterit vel discere, postquam  
Tondenti ingremium candida barba cadit<sup>45</sup>

a couplet which, to me, refers both to old age and death.

Nam fugiunt anni more fluentis aquae...<sup>46</sup>  
Nec redit unda fluens, nec redit hora ruens...

Though the "Farewell to His Cell" is better than Alcuin's other verse, and though it is certainly not representative of his general style of poetry, I still feel he probably did write it.<sup>47</sup> The note of fear and wonder is the same:

Nil manet aeternum, nihil immutabile vere est,  
Obscurat sacrum nox tenebrosa diem.  
Decutit et flores subito hiems frigida pulcros,  
Perturbat placidum et tristior aura mare.  
Qua campis cervos agitabat sacra iuventus,  
Incumbit fessus nunc baculo senior.  
Nos miseri, cur te fugitivum, mundas, amamus?  
Tu fugis a nobis semper ubique ruens.  
Tu fugiens fugias, Christum nos semper amemus.<sup>48</sup>

At the same time, the "sadder breeze" which "ruffles the peaceful sea" seems to me the very opposite of a breeze of despair. This is a sign that the world is wider than the grammatical and rhetorical categories into which Alcuin would fit it, and a sign of his sensitivity to mysteries beyond man's immediate capacity to comprehend. Fittingly, this was also the awareness which provided the urgent motive for his effective work in the reform of teaching and writing, for which he is justly best remembered.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Ithaca, New York, 1959.

<sup>2</sup>*Eruditio und Sapientia: Weltbild und Erziehung in der Karolingerzeit; Untersuchungen zu Alcuins Briefen* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1965).

<sup>3</sup>New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1978.

<sup>4</sup>MGH *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, 1:243-44 (no. 23), 270-72 (no. 58), 274-75 (no. 61), 350-51 (no. 123). See n. 47.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 169-206 (no. 1); 207-20 (no. 3); 229-35 (no. 9).

<sup>6</sup>UTQ 33 (1963-64), 233-57.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 233.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 238.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Dag Norberg, *Manuel pratique de latin medieval* (Paris, 1968), pp. 28-9.

<sup>10</sup>"Classicism and Christianity: a Poetic Synthesis," *Latomus* 34 (1975): 224-31.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 229.

<sup>12</sup>This idea that the *grammaticus* had a special responsibility to understand and interpret the poets is a commonplace among early medieval grammarians, e.g., Sergius' *Commentary on Donatus*, "Ars grammatica praecipue consistit in intellectu poetarum et in recte scribendi loquendive ratione," H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* (rep. Hildesheim, 1961), 4: 468; Asper's *Ars Grammatica*, "Grammatica est scientia recte scribendi et enuncianti interpretandique poetarum," Keil, 5: 547; Maximus Victorinus' *Ars Grammatica*, "Grammatica quid est? Scientia interpretandi poetarum atque historicos et recte scribendi loquendique ratio," Keil, 6: 188. Similarly in Marius Victorinus, Keil, 6: 4; in Cassiodorus, Keil, 7: 214; in Audax, Keil, 7: 321; in Dositheus, Keil, 7: 376, etc.

<sup>13</sup>Cf. Alcuin, *De Grammatica*, PL 101: 853-54.

<sup>14</sup>*Idem*, *De Dialectica*, PL 101: 947-50.

<sup>15</sup>See, for example, MGH *Epistolae*, 4: 175-78 (no. 121), 166-70 (no. 114), and 542-44 (the letter of Leidrad).



<sup>16</sup>PL 101: 951; for these lines elsewhere in Alcuin, see MGH *Poet. Lat.*, 1: 298.

<sup>17</sup>*Etymologiae* 8.10.2: "Dicti autem gentiles, quia ita sunt ut fuerunt geniti, id est, sicut in carne descenderunt sub peccato, scilicet idolis servientes et necdum regenerati."

<sup>18</sup>See Edelstein, pp. 106-11 and 231-32.

<sup>19</sup>"O youth, whose years are ripe for learning,  
Study hard: time passes like a flowing river.  
Don't waste this time for learning in idle games.  
The flowing wave does not come back, the fleeting hour does not return

Your first youth should flower in pursuit of virtue.

That age may shine in great honour and glory.

Whoever should read this book, enjoy happy years

And, mindful of its author, pray: "God have mercy."

If, reader, you look to take up our staff of freedom,

First find strength by your own light:

Learn as a young man to argue with eloquence

That you may be to those about you, protector, remedy, and cause of happiness.

In your youth, I pray, learn a pleasant character and behaviour,  
That your name may be praised over the whole world."

MGH *Poet. Lat.*, 1: 299-300 (no. 80); PL 101: 949-50. Dümmler's MGH edition is easier to read, but Migne's reprint of Froben's edition more accurately indicates the purpose of the lines, since they are attached to the prose work for which they were written.

<sup>20</sup>*Ars Amatoria* 3. 62-64.

<sup>21</sup>"May a teacher instruct the good season of youth in studies,  
For the years flee like flowing water." MGH *Poet. Lat.*, 1: 319-20 (no. 93).

<sup>22</sup>"All the fleeting joys of the word flow far away  
And like flowing water do not come back again." *Ibid.*, 297-99 (no. 76).

<sup>23</sup>"And yet shadows come and darken it. What is more pleasant than the flowers of summer? But they perish in the winter's cold. What is sweeter than the body's health? But who believes he will always have it?...If the heavens and the earth are always changing in their various alternations...how much more must a particular delight in anything at all be transitory? PL 101: 849-54, esp. 851.

<sup>24</sup>"Nonne absque ratione est, animam absque decore et dignitate sua esse perpetuam? Consequens videtur utramque esse perpetuam, animam scilicet et sapientiam," PL 101: 852.

<sup>25</sup>Prov. 9, 1: "Sapientia aedificavit sibi domum, excidit columnas septem."

<sup>26</sup>"Although this sentence pertains to the divine wisdom that built a house - that is a body - for itself in the womb of the virgin and confirmed it with the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, and

illuminated it with the same gifts of the Church, which is the house of God, nevertheless, the wisdom of the liberal arts is established on seven pillars, nor does it lead anyone to perfect knowledge unless he is raised up by these seven columns or steps." PL 101: 853.

<sup>27</sup>MGH *Poet. Lat.*, 299 (no. 80); PL 101: 949.

<sup>28</sup>"Showing him the path of wisdom will be easy, so long as you love it for God, for purity of heart, for knowledge of truth, and for itself; and not for the praise of men, for worldly honours, or for the deceptive pleasures of wealth." PL 101: 850. I have eliminated Froben's "propter rerum scientiam," bracketed by Migne.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 854.

<sup>30</sup>Do you want to know, Pilgrim, how poets live after death?  
Observe how I speak as you read, for your voice is mine.

PL 101:802.

<sup>31</sup>See MGH *Epistolae*, 4: 107 (no. 65), 181 (no. 124), 166 (no. 114); or, for the first and last references, my *Two Alcuin Letter-Books* (Toronto, 1975), pp. 19 and 69.

<sup>32</sup>"Let those sit here who copy out the words of the divine law  
And the sacred sayings of the holy fathers.  
Here let them take care not to sow their nonsense among the words,  
And for the sake of nonsense may their hand not wander freely.  
They should carefully acquire corrected copies  
So the goose-quill may follow a straight path.  
They should make the sense clear in clauses and phrases  
And put all the punctuation in its proper place  
Lest the lector in church read the wrong things  
Or perhaps fall suddenly silent before the pious brethren.  
It is an excellent work to copy out sacred books,  
And the scribe will not lack his reward.  
Copying books is better than planting vines.  
The one serves the body, the other the soul.  
The master who reads the sacred sayings of the fathers  
Will be able to bring forth a great many things both new and old." MGH *Poet. Lat.*, 1: 320 (no. 94).

<sup>33</sup>Matthew 13.52.

<sup>34</sup>PL 101: 87-300.

<sup>35</sup>"Bring out the natural rules of grammar to answer them...Ask what mean there is between something true and not true? If he says, 'Nothing,' then conclude: therefore Christ, insofar as he is man, is either true God or not true God. But it is plainly absurd to say that he is God but not true God. Or if your adversary blushes at saying this, ask what is the mean between the true and the untrue according to dialectics; you should question whether a single person could be a true man and the picture of a man, which is not a true man. If he says, 'No,' then conclude: neither in Christ, who is one person in two natures, can there be something true and not true, but whatever is in him is true, for he is wholly God and wholly the true son of God, and



there is nothing fictitious in him." MGH *Epistolae*, 4: 338-39 (no. 204).

36, "...iis quoque sancti et catholici nostrae fidei doctores et defensores omnibus haeresiarchis in contentionibus publicis semper superiores exstiterunt." PL 101: 854.

37 *Diplomatic Studies in Latin and Greek Documents from the Carolingian Age* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1977), pp. 47-122. The presence of elements from the Mozarabic liturgy in the *Libri* seems to me incontrovertible evidence against Alcuin's authorship. See Ann Freeman, "Theodulf of Orléans and the *Libri Carolini*," *Speculum* 32 (1957): 665-705, and "Further Studies in the *Libri Carolini* I-II," *Speculum* 40 (1965): 203-289; "III," *Speculum* 46 (1971): 597-612.

38 Hubert Bastgen, ed., *Capitulare de Imaginibus: MGH Legum Sectio 3, Concilia 2, Supplementum* (Hannover-Leipzig, 1912-24), p. 3.

39 "The other side holds the life-giving deeds of Christ which, he, sent by his father, brought to the world." MGH *Poet. Lat.*, 2: 63-65, lines 179-244; esp. ll. 219-20.

40 MGH *Poet. Lat.*, 2: 480-82.

41 MGH *Poet. Lat.*, 2: 196-97 (no. 38); esp. lines 4-7:  
"Because the letter is more powerful than the vain shape of an image,  
And provides more beauty for the soul than the false  
Coloured picture, unfittingly displaying the exteriors of things.  
For faithful Scripture is the perfect norm of salvation."

42 "The Authorship of the 'Libri Carolini': Observations Prompted by a Recent Book," *RB* 89 (1979): 29-57.

43 "Cur Modo Carmina non Scribat," MGH *Poet. Lat.*, 1: 542 (no. 44).

44 *Ibid.*, 563-69 (no. 72).

45 "For the old man will not be able to learn very much  
After his white beard falls in the lap of the shearer."  
*Ibid.*, 319.20 (no. 93).

46 "For the years flee like flowing water..."  
"The flowing wave does not return, failing time does not come  
back..." *Ibid.*, 319-20 (no. 93); 299-300 (no. 80).

47 In a study published after this paper was complete, Peter Godman has provided solid support for the feeling expressed here that this poem is Alcuin's: "Alcuin's Poetic Style and the Authenticity of 'O Mea Cella,'" *SN* 3rd ser., 20 (1979): 555-83.

48 "Nothing lasts forever, nothing is really changeless,  
Night shadows blot the sacred light of day.  
Icy winter's scythe surprises the loveliest flowers,  
And a sadder breeze ruffles the peaceful sea.  
Where once inviolate youth chases deer through the fields,  
A weary old man leans on his staff.  
Pickle world - why do we love you, poor fools?  
You always run from us, always fail us.  
Well, run on; we shall give our love to Christ." *Ibid.*, 243-44.

# ENGLISH LIBRARIES BEFORE 1066: USE AND ABUSE OF THE MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE

David Dumville  
University of Cambridge

For an approach to the subject of the library, its function, and its holdings in Anglo-Saxon England we must rely on assemblages of data which can then be manipulated, classified, and analysed in response to specific needs. Unfortunately, however, these basic collections of materials are, for the most part, not available. Research has, as always, proceeded in a disorderly fashion. We have Neil Ker's invaluable *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain (NLGB)* and *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (now with its supplement),<sup>1</sup> Alan Bishop's *English Caroline Minuscule (ECM)* and the fundamental series of papers which preceded it,<sup>2</sup> the first two volumes (by Jonathan Alexander and Elzbieta Temple, respectively) of Alexander's *Survey of Illuminated Manuscripts in the British Isles*,<sup>3</sup> and - in a quite different class - Ogilvy's *Books Known to the English 597-1066* (which is, of course, more concerned with texts than with manuscripts).<sup>4</sup> We possess, in addition, a series of more detailed and pointed studies.

I have, of course, ignored thus far one monumental work. But I offer this brief listing in order to make the point that the major reference works which have appeared are works of analysis or, at least, of classification. In other words, splendid as these books are when taken on their own terms, they, in fact, invite us to run before we can walk. They give us classified or analytic lists when we do not have assembled the raw materials from which they have been created. Each of these works has been a boon to every scholar in the field on innumerable occasions; without them we should undoubtedly have made many (perhaps I should say, many more) foolish mistakes. In the cases of *NLGB* and *ECM*, the works invite a host of further questions of the most basic nature. The *Catalogue*, on the other hand, gives a conspectus -

*Insular Latin Studies*, ed. Michael Herren,  
Papers in Mediaeval Studies 1 (Toronto:  
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981)  
pp. 153-178



if that is the right word for a volume of such a size - of a whole literature, and no doubt a much more accurate and representative one (giving full weight in particular to the extensive and popular prose literature) than many a recent history of Old English literature. Yet one may legitimately doubt, I think, the wisdom and value of focussing attention on a vernacular literature in a way which divorces it from its essential Latin literary context; for if we study English literature in the vernacular without thoroughly integrating it with its native and external Latin context, we make a travesty of English culture. As with the literature, so a *fortiori* of the libraries which housed that literature and of the scriptoria which disseminated it. This is not the least of the reasons for welcoming the study, announced by Professor Colin Chase of the University of Toronto, of the Latin materials to be found in manuscripts containing Old English.

Desiderata in this field of study are, therefore, many and fundamental. I wish to discuss here some of the more general problems with which the subject is concerned, problems which may seem, at first glance, to be made more difficult of solution by the state of publication discussed above. I propose to consider also some of the problems, of both method and interpretation, which are suggested by recent research and publication and by recent scholarly trends.

#### *Surveys of the Manuscripts Materials*

What, then, are the desiderata of our field of enquiry? It seems to me that everything depends on the collection and publication of the raw manuscript evidence. Until such material is readily available, our efforts, in whichever direction, must of necessity be amateurish. When all the evidence is eventually assembled, we shall be in possession of only a fraction (an incalculable fraction, given so many variables) of what once existed; to accept an even smaller fraction, dictated merely by our own inertia, is a recipe for grievous error.

Do we then have a model to follow? The work I have so far avoided mentioning is, of course, E. A. Lowe's monumental *Codices Latini Antiquiores* (CLA) (and I should put alongside it, as an essential complement, the companion *Chartae*).<sup>5</sup> Here, of course, is the comprehensive collection of manuscript materials for a whole era of book production.

From it could be launched, I think it is fair to say, a major work of reinterpretation like Julian Brown's examination of insular script in his magnificent series of Lyell Lectures, "The Insular System of Scripts, ca. 600-ca. 850," whose hoped for appearance in print will give us many new and valuable insights.

For my purpose of looking at the library holdings of Anglo-Saxon England, one has only to undertake the straightforward task of making an abstract from CLA of the directly relevant matter before beginning more detailed work; and that from which one is making the abstract is itself an assemblage of the total context, both codicological and literary. In CLA, as complemented by the essential *Chartae*, one lacks only one thing: thorough indexing, telling one - above all - the texts which the manuscripts contain. Even here, however, our wants are being supplied by the extraordinarily thorough indices undertaken by Professor James John, of Cornell University; one hopes that such an invaluable resource will soon be available.

For the period up to A.D. 800, then, we are extraordinarily well served. We have only to extract the material and ask the right questions. If we remain ignorant, it is because we have asked the wrong questions or because we do not have sufficient surviving information to enable us to give an answer.

For the years from 800 to 1066 we are in a wholly different position. We have to go back almost to a pre-Lowe type of situation. Yet the surviving manuscript materials for the cultural history of these two and half centuries in England are enormously greater in quantity than for the preceding period. Where, then, do we begin? What I should like to suggest at the outset is that an English equivalent of CLA for this period should not be our model, but at best our long-term aim. If the approach we adopt towards this material is too grandiose, too comprehensive, and in every way too demanding, much time will be spent waiting for someone to finish a task he almost certainly will not complete. The very success of Lowe, starting such a major project after a lifetime's experience with manuscripts, having a succession of the most formidably able and learned collaborators, and completing it (against all odds) just before he died at a ripe old age forty years later, should in fact be a warning to us of the scale of such a comprehensive project and of the near impossibility of achieving it.

Various more limited projects have, in fact, been put in motion over the years. In 1962, in his inaugural lecture, Professor Julian



Brown announced a project to list all manuscripts of pre-Conquest English provenance, and ultimately to catalogue them.<sup>7</sup> In 1978, I received generous funding from the University of Pennsylvania to enable me to complete an annotated handlist of these manuscripts, which could then be circulated as a working guide to the manuscript sources for the period. Happily, these efforts, and many others tending in the same direction or on a more limited scale by other scholars, have now effectively been superseded by or incorporated in the project which Professor Helmut Gneuss has announced. The first result is the appearance, in *Anglo-Saxon England*, of "A Preliminary List of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1100."<sup>8</sup> The eventual intention is the publication of "a bibliographical handlist of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts": such a reference work, carried through under the auspices of a remarkable university department, would be an aid of immense value to Anglo-Saxonists.

#### *The Types of Evidence Provided by Manuscripts*

We can hope, therefore, to have the bulk of the raw materials available for use before too long. Our approach to the libraries, and to the manuscript production, of Anglo-Saxon England will be revolutionized. In the meantime, I can write only with the information and experience accumulated in a one-man effort, but aided at the final stage of preparation by a preview (which Professor Gneuss generously allowed me) of the "Preliminary List."

We need to think carefully about what kind of evidence we can expect and hope to obtain from such a collection of basic sources. We shall still not be able to rush at a cultural history of later Anglo-Saxon England, for the mass of information to be retrieved from this corpus will be enormous, and the interpenetrating issues are potentially so complex.

I think that the material offered divides itself, for my purposes here, into three principal groups, though no doubt opinions will differ on this: (1) the evidence provided by the physical existence of the manuscripts; (2) the evidence offered by the texts purveyed by these manuscripts; and (3) the evidence for lost (or unidentified) manuscripts and their contents.

The "physical" evidence gives us, above all, a sense of the size of manuscript output, though in a purely relative way since we possess no formula which will enable us to relate the quantity of surviving

manuscripts to the quantity originally produced. We can gain a sense of how output and standards compare with other periods or places; but even the route to this modest type of comparison is fraught with difficulties arising from our many areas of ignorance. Observation also of the layout and make-up of manuscripts and of the juxtaposition of texts can tell us something about attitudes to types of texts, to competing or complementary languages, and so on.

We are offered also, of course, evidence for the existence of a certain body of texts in English libraries in the period in question. Naturally, we cannot guarantee from their presence, especially in foreign immigrant manuscripts, that because a copy of a text existed it was read. But we are at least made aware of the possibility of physical evidence able to support an argument which may have been made on textual grounds; or we may be offered a new range of possible literary influences, hitherto unsuspected or unproved, on English authors of the period. This is not, of course, to assert that because a manuscript of a given work existed at Worcester it could have been used by a Canterbury author, for example: one must be on one's guard against that kind of supporting argument.

We learn, too, not merely which authors and texts were available and might have been read, but what kind of literature was being produced and copied at that time. The work of Michael Lapidge over the past decade has indicated what riches there are for those who wish to work on Anglo-Latin and who can cope with the rigours of the hermeneutic style.<sup>9</sup>

The recognition and examination of consistent patterns of gloss or comment in a manuscript or, better, a group of manuscripts can introduce us in a revealing way to the cultural milieu of a literary or quasi-literary personality. The obvious example from recent scholarship is the group of manuscripts associated - whether rightly or not - with Archbishop Wulfstan. That was the growth-industry of the last generation.<sup>10</sup> That of the present generation of scholarship seemed to me to be about St. Dunstan,<sup>11</sup> a figure who - like Wulfstan - transcends simple institutional boundaries; but Byrhtferth of Ramsey has suddenly seized the stage.<sup>12</sup> No doubt other figures - some of whom will hopefully be anonymous and perhaps, therefore, able to be viewed more dispassionately - will emerge from the new corpus of materials.



The literary borrowings by datable or localizable Anglo-Latin authors will also be of considerable interest when considered in the light of the manuscript evidence. Various points may emerge. With the aid of an indexed handlist, it may very well be possible, by collation, to identify the precise copy of a source used by an author. This would lead to various possible conclusions. Such an identification would help give a provenance to the manuscript and perhaps, through consequent links with other scribes or manuscripts, would give it a point of origin. Annotations in the manuscript might then be able to be associated with the English author in question, and more could be learned about him as a literary personality.

Alternatively, study of the English manuscript tradition of a work might indicate a lack of evidence for the circulation of a given branch of the tradition in England. An authorial borrowing from that branch might then be questioned, and a context for an alternative indirect borrowing sought.

There are various ways, with the aid of the handlist under discussion, in which the former existence of now lost manuscripts can be demonstrated. The greatest difficulty will arise in the situation where such a manuscript (whose existence in, say, the tenth century can be demonstrated) was a continental book. That continental manuscript may still survive but bear no physical indication that it has ever been in England; if it remains in an English library it cannot escape forever, but if it returned to the continent its English history might escape detection almost indefinitely.

However, such caveats aside (for it is no use postponing a handlist on such considerations), lost manuscripts can be documented. A non-authorial copy of a text must have an exemplar; if the manuscript is English, and the exemplar cannot be identified as extant in the text history, then we have clear evidence for another copy of that text in England (whether it was itself English or foreign is another matter) at the period of copying. The English tradition of a work may presuppose any number of lost copies of the work, to complete the stemma; and stemmatics can only ever give a minimum number of lost copies. Borrowings by Anglo-Latin authors may indicate an exemplar of insular or continental origin which cannot be identified. Textual historical or paleographical criteria, or both together, may establish dependence of a copy on two different (and perhaps incomplete) exemplars. It may be possible to show, once glossing traditions are

better understood,<sup>13</sup> that text and gloss (or different layers of gloss) depend on different exemplars. Collations may be identified, pointing to that constant medieval inferiority complex about the state of one's own copy of a text and incidentally indicating the former existence of another copy. A lost copy of a work can never be posited without a great deal of hard work, but over a period we should be able to build up a rather less skeletal picture of English library resources in the Anglo-Saxon period, and particularly in its latter half.

We might refer to one final source of indications of now lost manuscripts, and these at particular centres, namely, deliberate statements about library holdings. The best known are, of course, Alcuin's account of the library at York<sup>14</sup> and the twelfth-century copy of the list of Bishop Aethelwold's donation of books to Peterborough.<sup>15</sup> All the surviving library catalogues (which also belong to this type of statement) are of post-Conquest date, but it is sometimes possible to extract some pre-Conquest information from them.<sup>16</sup>

#### *The Actual Manuscripts: Analysis of the Materials*

It is still very difficult to say with any certainty how many manuscripts survive which were in English libraries before 1066. Two major difficulties are the scatter of English manuscripts in continental libraries (and, for the early period, doubts as to whether or not they were rather products of expatriate - or Celtic - institutions) and the problem of identifying continental manuscripts once in England but since returned, under whatever circumstances, to the continent. A case in point is the tangled history of a manuscript like the currently fashionable Vaticanus Latinus 3363, a ninth-century French Boethius, annotated in a Welsh hand of ca. 900 (Asser has been both suggested and doubted) and in the hand currently identified as Dunstan's; it now lies in a continental repository.<sup>17</sup> Less exotic, perhaps, is a history like that of the Utrecht Psalter which spawned a pre-Conquest Canterbury progeny and remained in England, but returned to the continent in modern times.<sup>18</sup> Here are famous manuscripts; but many more humble ones undoubtedly lie unnoticed on the continent. They are likely to be found, in any number, by someone looking for tell-tale traces,<sup>19</sup> however few, of an English history. Anglo-Caroline manuscripts themselves, however, are similarly scattered: the extraordinary Vergil in the Vatican's Reginensis collection (discovered some fifteen years ago by English scholars, and assigned



by Mr. Bishop to Worcester)<sup>20</sup> and a liturgical manuscript found in Poland by Dr. Temple<sup>21</sup> are merely two examples of what will continue to disturb any comfortable but hasty assumptions that we have identified all the important surviving manuscripts.

Something of the order of four hundred insular manuscripts of the seventh and eighth centuries have been extracted from *CLA*; of these about one hundred should be deleted as doubtfully relevant to England. For the ninth century, on the other hand, we have, as far as I know, no count, though the number of surviving books is assuredly very small indeed.<sup>22</sup> Again, as far as I know, no public attempt has been made to count the Latin books in that characteristically tenth-century English script, the Anglo-Saxon square minuscule; in fact, there would seem to be about eighty. Of the Anglo-Caroline which spans the last century, or century and a quarter, of the English state - from the mid-tenth-century copy of *Smaragdus on the Rule of St. Benedict* (Cambridge, University Library, MS Ee. 2.4) to the "Cambridge Songs" manuscript (Gg.5.35) or the Worcester Passional (Corpus Christi College MS 9), if I may stay with Cambridge manuscripts! - there survive, according to Mr. Bishop's count, some six hundred books and fragments,<sup>23</sup> though I must confess that I have not yet identified anything like that number. And of course we know from Dr. Ker's *Catalogue* of some four hundred vernacular items, of which perhaps 150 were written wholly or principally in Old English; of these, approximately five-sixths belong to the tenth and eleventh centuries.<sup>24</sup>

Some divisions, on grounds of script, between manuscripts (or annotating hands) originating in different areas can also be made, both for the pre-Viking period and for the tenth century, between major political units or geographical regions or spheres of ecclesiastical influence. In any event, we have a substantial amount of material, and various preliminary ways - primarily palaeographical - of classifying it. This brings me to the question of the evidence on which manuscripts have been assigned to specific centres.

#### *The Attribution of Manuscripts to Centres*

There are innumerable items of evidence which allow us to assign manuscripts a location, whether a simple provenance or even a point of origin. In this matter, I propose to focus here on two questions: first, on what the sum total of that evidence appears to tell us; and secondly, on the disturbing implications of new work, on Anglo-Saxon

royal diplomas of the period 924-1016, for the attribution of manuscripts of that period to a given centre on the evidence of script or scribe.

The second edition of Neil Ker's *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, published in 1964, is the reference base for an attempt to obtain an overview of library holdings in this period. But it is not, of course, one of the aims of that book to answer straightforward questions about library holdings before 1066, and we must proceed with caution. By my count, Ker notices 342 manuscripts of pre-Conquest date as having been in the possession of an identifiable institution at any time before 1540. It is in the nature of his book that it cannot tell us in detail when the manuscript was at a given place or what the evidence is that it was indeed there. A code simply indicates the class of evidence used. In general, where an attribution depends on script alone, that is regarded as an insufficient basis for inclusion.<sup>25</sup> Contents and external features are, therefore, the key classes of evidence. Criteria of inclusion and exclusion are deliberately not applied with rigorous consistency, however.<sup>26</sup>

Among those 342 notices there are some duplications of entry; some manuscripts, which have travelled, naturally show evidence for their presence at more than one centre. Ker's listing does not tell us which manuscripts are English and which are not, or, for that matter, when the foreign books came to England, if indeed that is known.

There are many difficulties for us, then, in using these data. How are we to refine the information to our purpose? The first point to be borne in mind is that, given the criteria for inclusion, this number of 342 is a maximum. I have rarely, if ever, seen notice by those citing Ker's book of his indications of doubt. In fact, the notices of some seventy-two of these manuscripts carry a question-mark to warn the user that the evidence for their location is not wholly satisfactory. Of the remaining 270 volumes, some seventeen are assigned to institutions which did not exist before the Norman Conquest.<sup>27</sup> Abandoning these rather precise figures, we may say that there are many manuscripts - and perhaps especially those of foreign origin - which are unlikely to have been, before 1066, at the place of their later known provenance. This is perhaps the most difficult area: it is where the paleographer's working rule (most frequently enunciated by Mr. Bishop)<sup>28</sup> - that, barring specific indications to the contrary, a manuscript may be presumed to have originated at the



place of its medieval provenance - is most likely to be a false guide. Take, for instance, the case of Bury Saint Edmunds (Suffolk), where a reformed monastery was established in the early eleventh century.<sup>29</sup> Twenty-one pre-Conquest volumes are assigned by Ker to Bury, all but one on excellent - indeed, unimpeachable - evidence.<sup>30</sup> Yet, of these, one third can be recognised as continental books of the ninth century.<sup>31</sup> I can find no evidence that some were in England before 1066;<sup>32</sup> others indicate that they were in England already in the mid-tenth century,<sup>33</sup> well before the foundation of reform Bury.

In other words, Ker's listing can, for our purpose, be only the very beginning of an enquiry. I shall have more to say later about other difficulties in store for us as users of this material. However, I want now to try to assess the usefulness to us of work done since 1964, in particular the research embodied in T. A. M. Bishop's *English Caroline Minuscule* (1971) and in his series of preliminary papers, published principally in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*.<sup>34</sup> It is a tragedy that when this enormous work, of well over a decade's intensive researches, came to be summarized, it had to be within the exceedingly brief compass of an Oxford Palaeographical Handbook. We have been deprived thereby of an enormous amount of information, insight, and considered judgement. Mr. Bishop has since taken up another major subject and we are unlikely to see further fruits of his Anglo-Caroline labours. Starting from the evidence of ownership, of the sort that I referred to earlier; following the working rule about the *stabilitas* of the average manuscript book; and then concentrating, above all, on identifying individual scribes and their work and the relations of these with one another, Bishop has assigned between three hundred and four hundred specimens an origin at one of a small number of key centres - hardly more than thirteen in number.<sup>35</sup> And he makes the point that "no more than seven scriptoria (St. Augustine's, Canterbury; Christ Church, Canterbury; Abingdon; Winchester, Old Minster; Winchester, New Minster; Worcester; and Exeter) supplied about half the items (about three hundred, therefore) recognized as examples of English Caroline."<sup>36</sup>

It is plain that the tenth and eleventh centuries constituted a period of considerable manuscript production in England, and principally in the south. If Mr. Bishop's assignments of manuscripts to given centres are accurate, and if some means could be found by which all his detailed judgements could be made available to the interested

public, we should have at our disposal an incomparable resource for the history of the period.

However, there is one recent major development which casts some considerable doubt, in principle at least, on the potential accuracy of these attributions of origin to groups of Anglo-Caroline manuscripts. Bishop's principal method was to proceed by linking in chains manuscripts sharing collaborating scribes. Occasionally, a generic likeness would be invoked to make a connection between an attributed and an unattributed group,<sup>37</sup> a procedure which has its dangers but where the opinion of an acknowledged expert must be treated with considerable respect. Another caveat which would be entered by someone like myself - a historian interested in manuscripts rather than a professional palaeographer - would be that these long chains, depending on the identification of the work of individual scribes, contain what appears to be a worryingly high degree of subjectivity of judgement. A more tangible and substantial difficulty has been presented by new work on the Latin diplomas of English kings from Aethelstan to Aethelred, 924 to 1016.

It has been the generally received doctrine (if the details have nonetheless been the subject of uncertainty and dispute) that the substantial series of Latin royal diplomas issued at this period was produced by ecclesiastical institutions acting as, or on behalf of, the recipient of the benefit conveyed by the charter.<sup>38</sup> However, Dr. Simon Keynes has now systematically demolished this view, demonstrating the existence in this period of what must certainly be called a royal chancery staff.<sup>39</sup> Recognition of the centralized production of royal charters, based on a professional group of royal scribes, brings in its train a series of acute problems for our study of book-production in these years.

Under the old view of their production, original single-sheet diplomas - once recognized as such - offered specimens of script which were not merely precisely dated but localized too. A royal charter to Abingdon could automatically be assigned to the Abingdon scriptorium, for example.<sup>40</sup> (It was partly for this reason that the new British Academy series was designed to be published by archive, rather than by reign or other period. It now seems plain that when the current series has been completed, we shall have to have another, and much more heavily edited, series arranged chronologically to complement it.) Charter-evidence could, on this view of charter-production, be used



as key evidence for the location of scribes or script-varieties. The same scribe, identified in a diploma and in a book, would locate that book beyond reasonable doubt. This argument must now be stood on its head, or worse. At best, the identification would show either that the book in question was itself the product of a royal writing-office (and, at the present state of our knowledge, that would probably be a rather rash conclusion) or that the scribe of the charter was also, at some point in his career, a member of the scriptorium in which the book had been produced. In other words, we must now use the evidence of books to help us identify the scriptoria whose members also saw service in the royal writing-office, rather than relying on charters to locate manuscript-books.<sup>41</sup> Plainly we have lost a good deal of apparent evidence, and our task of localizing tenth and eleventh-century manuscripts has become noticeably more difficult.

It is difficult, as yet, to assess the full impact of this development on Bishop's attributions. Examination of his detailed papers does indicate reliance on such charter-evidence at key points in various arguments. There is, of course, no question at all of his conclusions being uniformly vitiated. His research always begins within the solid external and contextual evidence of provenance and origin. However, all that work will have to be reconsidered in detail. Here, surely, is a classic case of developments in a related field overturning assumptions and constructs in ours.

The principal casualty will be apparent identifications of the scribes and scripts of the less important centres, from which books are not yet directly identifiable: a good example is Saint Albans, for which an Aethelredian charter of the year 1007 was taken by Bishop as a representative script specimen.<sup>42</sup> There are still wider implications: the type of Anglo-Caroline script believed to be characteristic of houses of the Aethelwold connection was supposed, on the evidence of its royal diplomas of the early reform period, to be particularly associated with, and perhaps even created at, Abingdon.<sup>43</sup> In fact, the removal of this charter-evidence creates great doubts about the productivity of the Abingdon scriptorium before ca. 1000 and destroys the argument for early association of Anglo-Caroline Type I with Abingdon.<sup>44</sup>

#### *The Library and the Use of Books*

I wish to turn now to a very rapid consideration of just what we

mean when we speak of a "library" at this period. We can attack this rather important question both from the manuscripts themselves and from external evidence. Many scholars have written on the general problems surrounding the early medieval library, but probably the most convenient general introduction for students of English culture is Francis Wormald's paper on "The Monastic Library."<sup>45</sup>

In this period we are of course talking primarily, though not exclusively, about the monastic library. But, before following up the more complex implications of that point, I should like to mention some of the specific functions of books in the monastic context. A high proportion of our surviving manuscript volumes comprises gospel books, miscellaneous books of the bible, legendaries and passionals, and more strictly liturgical books. We cannot guarantee that any of these would serve as what we would recognize nowadays as a library-book. Some of the biblical matter and all of the *liturgica* would belong in church.<sup>46</sup> The legendary and the passional would probably find principal employment in the refectory, in the provision of pious reading during meals.<sup>47</sup> In short, the bulk of the largest group of our surviving manuscripts can hardly be referred to a library context. In later English library catalogues such volumes are often not listed, but turn up in inventories of movable property, including relics, the church plate, and other church furnishings. Wormald, in fact, conjectured that some saints' lives and some *liturgica* were kept with the local saints' relics, or at any rate in close proximity to the shrine of a local saint.<sup>48</sup>

One of our major problems, especially in the earlier period, is to understand the general attitude to books and reading prevalent in any given monastery or federation of monasteries. A plethora of rules, particularly in Ireland, enunciated conflicting positions concerning almost every facet of monastic life.<sup>49</sup> We know - or think we know - what St. Benedict had to say on the subject. But a major desideratum is the study of all the other surviving rules to determine their attitudes. In Benedictine monasteries - and for England this is not a serious trend until the tenth-century reform<sup>50</sup> - there are certain normal features. There was a corporate book collection, an institutional library. The monks spent a certain amount of time reading the bible, and on a regular basis. St. Benedict's prescriptions are found in section 48 of his *Regula*, and those for reading aloud in the refectory are in section 38. As far as we can tell, on very poor evidence, the



books were kept in cupboards or closets (*almarium* or *almarium* is the usual word).<sup>51</sup>

There are many accounts of the ceremony at which, on the first Monday in Lent, there was a solemn distribution of books in the chapter-house.<sup>52</sup> This would serve as reading for a specified period, sometimes for an entire year. Dom Anscari Mundó, in a now classic article,<sup>53</sup> showed how, by a fundamental misunderstanding of the word *bibliotheca* from the Carolingian period onwards, library-reading rather than strictly bible-reading came to be specified. As a result, suitable matter needed to be chosen especially for Lent. One charming list of acceptable reading was referred to by Mundó: specified for Lent was that the most bizarre text of insular associations, the *Cosmographia* of Aethicus Ister!<sup>54</sup>

The institutional library therefore needed a point of supply for its reading-matter. But it would probably be a mistake to assume that the house scriptorium necessarily provided most of these needs. There was likely to have been an unending, if very occasional, supply of books from outside, obtained by gift, by purchase at home or abroad, or by exchange. It would be interesting to study the proportion of liturgical to non-liturgical books among those manuscripts whose writing could be ascribed to the scriptorium of the house which (later) owned them; we might find that the smaller scriptoria in particular devoted all or most of their efforts to liturgical books, and obtained other types of book by various different means.

In the reform-period, the example of Leofric, though famous, must nonetheless have been fairly typical. Bishop Leofric of Crediton decided to move his diocesan seat to St. Peter's Minster, Exeter, in 1050. But he found it necessary to endow his canons with a library, for when he got to Exeter he found no general library, but one capitulary, one epistle-book, one old private breviary, and one old lectionary in a poor condition. Many monastic houses were founded or re-founded in the reform period, and would have needed books. It is interesting to ask, for I shall do no more, how the founders - whether lay or ecclesiastical - got hold of books for this purpose. Leofric's impressive library - the list of the donation survives - includes manuscripts written at the two Canterbury houses and some interesting foreign volumes.<sup>55</sup>

The current appearance of manuscripts may give some indication of how books were used, but we should beware of too facile generalizations.

Glossing does not necessarily mean that the particular copy of a book was read, much less used in class - the whole concept of the "classbook" seems to be in severe need of a re-evaluation.<sup>56</sup> Judging by consistent (if undatable) marking one does find in pre-Conquest books, they were indeed used as research resources,<sup>57</sup> whether by authors or by someone doing a little research, perhaps for the purposes of legal (or even theological) controversy.

We need to look also at the institutional evidence for libraries. We find a few books which seem to be candidates for recognition as volumes tied to an office, handed down from one incumbent to the next: one might mention the Parker Chronicle and, in Ireland, the Book of Armagh.<sup>58</sup> But libraries seem to be found in at least one other context, the royal. Whether Anglo-Saxon kings ever had court-libraries or palace-schools is uncertain: a case could perhaps be made for Alfred of Wessex. A case has been made, if not conclusively, for the importance of the New Minster, Winchester, as a point of dissemination of manuscripts in the tenth and eleventh centuries,<sup>59</sup> and one is bound to wonder if this alleged process owes anything to royal patronage. We know that Alfred, through necessity, farmed out his works far and wide to scriptoria;<sup>60</sup> Aethelstan commissioned a book from Glastonbury to give to Chester-le-Street in the 930's.<sup>61</sup> But Aethelstan was also the owner of a whole series of foreign volumes, often of luxurious quality, impressively studied by Armitage Robinson,<sup>62</sup> which he mostly donated to religious houses. We see relatively few monarchs taking a direct interest in books. In the earlier period Aldfrith of Northumbria, and a generation or so later Ceolwulf - who vetted or (to put it more unkindly) censored Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* - are those who are known to have had literary interests.<sup>63</sup> Whether kings ever commissioned copies of books for themselves we do not know; if they did so in the tenth or the eleventh century we equally do not know whether or not the royal writing-office could have coped. In short, we know nothing of any possible relationship of chancery, court-library, and palace-school.

#### *Learning and External Contacts*

Naturally, one of the key results we can obtain from a study of the manuscripts of the period seen as a whole is a sense of the shifting patterns of cultural development (or stagnation or decline), the effects of external influences, and so on. I am not going to try



to survey all these developments here, but I should like to draw attention to areas where - it seems to me - particularly promising developments can be expected to take place. A census of manuscripts will obviously produce its most valuable results in the period after 800, for which we have so far had no compendious work. There are perhaps four areas where I think we may hope for some enlightenment.

The ninth is, of course, the dark century when visible manifestations of the literary culture of the Anglo-Saxon golden age vanish, to be replaced by the evidence of barbarity of the sort which Michael Lapidge has described in his contribution. I should not wish to stress that collapse to the same extreme degree that Nicholas Brooks<sup>64</sup> and he have done nor, I think, should I wish to take King Alfred's words<sup>65</sup> absolutely at face value. I remind myself that from the last third of the ninth century for example, we have a perfectly respectable, if provincial, piece of work in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 63, a collection of computistical matter;<sup>66</sup> this comes from the very period when Northumbria, its area of origin, is supposed to have lain most heavily under the Danish yoke. In short, I hope that a census of manuscripts will produce material which will give us a more rounded view of ninth-century Anglo-Latin culture than we have at present, and which will, perhaps, somewhat dispel the gloom in the background to my next area of desired enlightenment.

We need to know a great deal more about the development of script, of scriptoria, and of Latin learning in the last decade of the ninth century and in the first quarter of the tenth century. There has been recent, important work on the subject by Dr. Robert Deshman of the University of Toronto<sup>67</sup> and there are general signs of a quickening of interest among scholars.<sup>68</sup> However, work in this field has proceeded from non-palaeographical assumptions, and again I should like to stress the dangers, as with the charters, of relying for the first principles on work or assumptions from other fields of study, which, when challenged, may wreak havoc on one's own. It is a commonplace among scholars studying the period that there are five manuscripts, deriving from a single scriptorium (which has been argued to be the Old Minster at Winchester) in the last decade of the ninth century and the very beginnings of the tenth. They are the first section of the Parker Chronicle (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 173), at least in part; the Tollemache Old English Orosius (London, British Library, MS Add. 47967); BL MS Cotton Otho B.xi (and its *dissecta membra*); BL MS

Royal 12.D.17 (Bald's Leechbook); and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 27 (the Junius Psalter). This is stated bluntly, for example in *MLGB*,<sup>69</sup> and has been elaborated by many writers. It is on this group of manuscripts that, as Alistair Campbell put it, our knowledge of early West Saxon is grounded.<sup>70</sup> And here is the English evidence for the beginnings of that Square type of Anglo-Saxon minuscule which is so characteristic a script of the tenth century. It is imperative that we understand the origins of this script type,<sup>71</sup> for it is an index of the revival of English scriptorial standards during, or, as I should now prefer, in the wake of the Alfredian revival. I have searched high and low for independent evidence which would confirm the dating assigned to these examples of incipient and early Square minuscule. But the dating seems to depend entirely on arguments arising from perceptions of the early history of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. In the course of work towards a project for a new collaborative edition of the Chronicle and its related records, I have been re-examining its textual history. The first scribe's portion of the A-text (CCCC 173) stops in the middle of the annal for 891; from this it has generally been concluded that the manuscript was first written at that date.<sup>72</sup> Yet, for want of comparable but independently dated specimens of script, I did not think that judgement could be even approximately confirmed on palaeographical evidence. For a series of reasons which seem to me compelling, I do not think the dating can be right; I should conclude instead that a case can be made for a view that the text up to the annal for 920, ending on fol. 25v, was written by collaborating scribes of the 920's.<sup>73</sup> Such a redating would necessarily affect the chronology of the development of the script. In short, the unfortunate circumstance recurs that reconsideration of a textual question causes great difficulties for settled paleographical doctrine. Our subject is still at the stage of development where too much certainty can arise from an insufficient assemblage of evidence.

A census of manuscripts owned in Anglo-Saxon England will necessarily throw into relief immigrants from the Celtic-speaking countries of the British Isles and from the continent. Approximately one hundred such manuscripts are at present known from the whole period.<sup>74</sup> Among these, one notable group has recently been the subject of investigation, books of Breton origin.<sup>75</sup> Brittany, as a continental country of Celtic speech and institutions, but politically and in its ecclesiastical culture heavily influenced by the Frankish



empire on its eastern border, almost falls between the two general areas I have distinguished. During the century beginning with the arrival of Asser at King Alfred's court, the Celtic-speaking countries provided a great source of intellectual stimulus for the reviving ecclesiastical learning of Anglo-Saxon England.<sup>76</sup> Brittany was an early and major influence on the ecclesiastical revival in southern England at the beginning of the tenth century, a development which would have been perceived very dimly but for the cumulative effect of manuscript evidence. The Welsh and Cornish contribution could hardly have been appreciated without such evidence. Detailed work on tenth-century manuscripts of English origin is also revealing much evidence for the use of exemplars of Celtic origin, and has even suggested the presence of Celtic scribes in Anglo-Saxon scriptoria.<sup>77</sup> Further work will assuredly produce more insights of this sort. But it was not only the Celtic speaking countries which contributed to the revivification of English religion and learning in the tenth century. As work proceeds on the history of tenth-century Anglo-Latin literature, more points of contact are found with continental centres, scholars, and literary fashions.<sup>78</sup> The manuscript evidence, while extremely varied, is nonetheless fairly consistently pointing to Rheims,<sup>79</sup> northeast France,<sup>80</sup> the Liège region,<sup>81</sup> and Flanders<sup>82</sup> as principal sources of imported manuscripts. What further work must seek to promote is a greater comprehension of the particular contexts in which the known imported books arrived in England; very useful results can be expected in this area, which may lead to further modification of traditional views on the sources of the tenth-century reform culture.

Finally, there are, I believe, grounds for the supposition that our view may change of the Anglo-Saxon eleventh century in respect of book production and ecclesiastical learning. It has long been believed that the steam went out of the reforming monastic movement by the early eleventh century, leading to an increased secularism and a decline in learning in the late Anglo-Saxon church. Professor Frank Barlow provided an effective, if only partial, defence of the English church from ca. 1000 to 1066,<sup>83</sup> but powerful confirmation of the old established view was suggested upon the publication of *ECM*. Mr. Bishop wrote that the "intellectual movement which the Caroline accompanied seems to have been poorly sustained" and noted that in the eleventh century "the script seems to be in decline," a decline paralleled "in intellectual interests and commerce";<sup>84</sup> his harshest comments are

are reserved for the period from the middle years of the century when he sees "intellectual curiosity and Anglo-Latin letters alive but hardly flourishing."<sup>85</sup> It might be supposed from all this that English book-production went into a sharp decline during the first quarter of the eleventh century, a trend which was not reversed until the massive Anglo-Norman multiplication of texts at the end of the century. The statistics which may now be collected from Gneuss's list suggest nothing of the sort, however. From the middle years of the tenth century to the beginning of the eleventh, we have some two hundred surviving books and fragments. In the roughly comparable period from then until the Norman Conquest we have approximately the same number, perhaps a few more. These two corpora will have to be studied in much more detail before one can elaborate on the proposition that book-production did not suffer a serious decline in the Anglo-Saxon eleventh century. When manuscripts can be more closely dated (say, to quarter-centuries) we must discover what changes occur over shortish periods. We must ask which centres were active at which particular times. We shall need to know about evidence for continuing use of the tenth-century books. The contents of new books will have to be scrutinized for changes in taste. The relationship between Latin and the vernacular in the book-production of a period when a formal separation of Latin and vernacular scripts took place will bear much study, though it already seems clear that in the eleventh century a greater proportion of English books was written in the vernacular than was the case in the tenth (unless tenth-century vernacular manuscripts were subject to more severe vicissitudes than their Latin counterparts). In brief, we may say that the eleventh century must necessarily come into its own as an area of study, in the way that the tenth century has held our attention during the past decade. The cultural history of Anglo-Saxon England still offers many avenues of enquiry and many revelations for its students. To the extent that the period after A. D. 800 has been less comprehensively studied, the greatest gains may be expected there. The publication in 1980 of Helmut Gneuss's "Preliminary List" should inaugurate a decade of substantial advances from a secure base of primary materials. The student now has the raw materials at hand; he has only to start to manipulate them. Studies of manuscripts and of the circulation of texts should flourish, in much the same way that the study of Anglo-Latin letters has burgeoned in the 1970's. With the resources now available we may hope to see more use and less abuse of manuscript-evidence in writing early English cultural history.



## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*. (2nd ed. London, 1964), first published in 1941; *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), and supplement in ASE 5 (1976).
- <sup>2</sup> T. A. M. Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford, 1971); for his other essays, see notes 34 and 71 below.
- <sup>3</sup> J. J. G. Alexander, *Insular Manuscripts, 6th to the 9th Century* (London, 1978); E. Temple, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts 900-1066* (London, 1976).
- <sup>4</sup> J. D. A. Ogilvy, *Books Known to the English 597-1066* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), first published as *Books Known to Anglo-Latin Writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin (670-804)* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936).
- <sup>5</sup> E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores. A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts prior to the Ninth Century* (12 vols., Oxford, 1934-71; with revised edition of vol. 2, Oxford, 1972); A. Bruckner & R. Marichal, *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores* (Olten, 1954-, in progress).
- <sup>6</sup> Cf. Lowe, *CLA, Supplement*, p. xi, and J. J. John's account of Lowe's work, *American Council of Learned Societies Newsletter* 20/5 (October, 1969).
- <sup>7</sup> T. J. Brown, "Latin Palaeography since Traube," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 3 (1959-63): 361-81 (at p. 372).
- <sup>8</sup> ASE 9 (1980): 1-60.
- <sup>9</sup> See his survey, "The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature," ASE 4 (1975): 67-111; on tenth-century poetry see also his "Three Latin Poems from Aethelwold's School at Winchester," ASE 1 (1972): 85-137, and "Some Latin Poems as Evidence for the Reign of Athelstan," ASE 9 (1980): 61ff.
- <sup>10</sup> The work of Karl Jost, Dorothy Bethurum, and Dorothy Whitelock, who brought Wulfstan to full scholarly attention, is summarized and discussed in *Continuations and Beginnings*, ed. E. G. Stanley (London, 1966). For a close study of one of the manuscripts see H. R. Loyn, *A Wulfstan Manuscript Containing Institutes, Laws and Homilies*, British Museum Cotton Nero A.1 (Copenhagen, 1971), a facsimile reproduction. The paleographical arguments are developed by N. R. Ker, "The Handwriting of Archbishop Wulfstan," in *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. P. Clemoes and K. Hughes (Cambridge, 1971). That their work has created

something of a scholarly fiction is suggested by C. E. Hohler, "Some Service-Books of the Later Saxon Church," in *Tenth-Century Studies*, ed. David Parsons (Chichester, 1975).

- <sup>11</sup> See R. W. Hunt, *St. Dunstan's Classbook from Glastonbury* (Amsterdam, 1961), a facsimile edition of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct. F.4.32 (S.C. 2176); T. A. M. Bishop, "An Early Example of Insular Caroline," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 4 (1964-8): 396-400; H. Gneuss, "Dunstan und Hrabanus Maurus: zur Hs. Bodleian Auctarium F.4.32," *Anglia* 96 (1978): 136-48; M. Lapidge, "St. Dunstan's Latin Poetry," *Anglia* 98 (1980): 101-6. See also n. 17 below.
- <sup>12</sup> See in particular C. R. Hart, "The Ramsey Computus," *EHR* 85 (1970): 29-44; idem, "Byrthferth and his Manual," *MAe* 41 (1972): 95-109; M. Lapidge, "Byrthferth and the Vita S. Ecgwini," *MS* 41 (1979): 31-53; and "Byrthferth of Ramsey and the Early Sections of the *Historia Regum* Attributed to Symeon of Durham," ASE 10 (1981); P. S. Baker, "The Old English Canon of Byrthferth of Ramsey," *Speculum* 55 (1980): 22-37.
- <sup>13</sup> Two forthcoming papers, by R. I. Page and M. Lapidge respectively, should do much to enlighten us; they will appear in a volume edited by Nicholas Brooks for the Leicester University Press.
- <sup>14</sup> *Versus de Sanctis Euboricensis Ecclesiae*, MGH, Poet. Lat 1: 169-206; esp. pp. 203-4, lines 1340-1556.
- <sup>15</sup> See M. R. James, *Lists of MSS formerly in Peterborough Abbey Library* (London, 1926).
- <sup>16</sup> See M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903), pp. xxxii-xxxiii, for an approach to the fragmentary twelfth-century catalogue from Christ Church, Canterbury, in Cambridge University Library, MS Ii.3.12; cf. Ker, *MLGB*, p. 29.
- <sup>17</sup> Pierre Courcelle, *La 'Consolation de Philosophie' dans la tradition littéraire* (Paris, 1967), pp. 267-70; Fabio Troncarelli, "Per una ricerca sui commenti altomedievali al *De Consolatione* di Beozio," in *Miscellanea in memoria di Giorgio Cencetti* (Torino, 1973), pp. 363-80, and a book long in press with Editrice Antenore (Padova); D. K. Bolton, "Remigian Commentaries on the 'Consolation of Philosophy' and their Sources," *Traditio* 33 (1977): 381-94. I owe to Professor Julian Brown my knowledge of the identification of the hand of "Dunstan" in the glosses to this manuscript.
- <sup>18</sup> F. Wormald, *The Utrecht Psalter* (Utrecht, 1953); D. Tselsos, "English Manuscript Illustration and the Utrecht Psalter," *Art Bulletin* 41 (1959): 137-49; Suzy Dufresne, "Les copies anglaises du Psautier d'Utrecht," *Scriptorium* 18 (1964): 185-97, and *Illustration du Psautier d'Utrecht: sources et apport carolingien* (Paris, 1978).
- <sup>19</sup> The productive, deliberate search for Breton manuscripts by Léon Fleuriot, *Dictionnaire des gloses en Vieux Breton* (Paris, 1964), introduction, is an example of the procedure which would have to be followed.



<sup>20</sup>Bishop, *ECM*, p. 17. At least three other copies of Vergil have been attributed to Anglo-Saxon England (Gneuss, nos. 477, 503, and 648); nos. 477 and 503 share a Bury St. Edmunds provenance ca. 1300, when the former (which seems continental to me, not English) was used as paste-downs, while the latter, in insular script perhaps of the tenth century, was palimpsested; both were glossed copies of the *Aeneid*.

<sup>21</sup>Temple, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, pp. 7, 107-8.

<sup>22</sup>Excluding books dated 'saec. viii/ix' (nine volumes: Gneuss, nos. 45, 432, 443, 456, 635, 647, 780, 885, 911) and 'saec. ix/x' (three books: Gneuss, nos. 52, 298, 462), I count fifteen in Gneuss' list (nos. 28, 88, 125-27, 282, 327, 375, 385, 448, 576, 611, 626, 857, 898).

<sup>23</sup>*ECM*, pp. xiv, xv, xvi.

<sup>24</sup>See his list, *Catalogue*, pp. xiv-xix. But only twenty date from the tenth century, and the last quarter of the eleventh century is (interestingly) almost bare; we therefore have more than a hundred vernacular manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon eleventh century.

<sup>25</sup>*MLGB*, pp. xx-xxi.

<sup>26</sup>*MLGB*, prefaces, *passim*.

<sup>27</sup>Battle (2), Buildwas (1), Hatfield Peverel/Regis (1), Lanthony (3), Lewes (1), London (Cripplegate Hospital) (1), Oxford (Carmelites) (1), Shrewsbury (1), Southwick (2), Waltham (1), Windsor (3).

<sup>28</sup>E.g. *ECM*, pp. xiv-xv.

<sup>29</sup>See the discussion by R. M. Thomson, "The Library of Bury St. Edmunds Abbey in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Speculum* 47 (1972): 617-45.

<sup>30</sup>Lambeth Palace MS 362 is the doubtful case. Gneuss does not include Cambridge, Pembroke College, MS 120.

<sup>31</sup>Gneuss, nos. 128, 133-7, 661.

<sup>32</sup>Gneuss, nos. 128, 133-4, 136.

<sup>33</sup>Gneuss, nos. 137, 661.

<sup>34</sup>"Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts," *TCBS* 1 (1949-53): 432-41; 2 (1954-8): 185-99, 323-36; 3 (1959-63): 93-5, 412-23; 4 (1964-8): 70-7; "An early example of Insular-Caroline," *Ibid.*, 4 (1964-8): 396-400; "The Copenhagen Gospel Book," *Nordisk Tidskrift for Bok och Biblioteksväsen* 54 (1967): 33-41; "Lincoln Cathedral MS 182," *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 2 (1967): 73-6; *Aethici Istrici Cosmographia: Codex Leidensis Scaligeranus* (Amsterdam, 1966), introduction.

<sup>35</sup>*ECM*, pp. xv, xiv.

<sup>36</sup>*ECM*, p. xv.

<sup>37</sup>E.g. *ECM*, p. 13; more fully in his "Lincoln Cathedral MS 182"

(note 34 above).

<sup>38</sup>See, for example, the contributions of Pierre Chaplais in *Prisca Munimenta*, ed. Felicity Ranger (London, 1973).

<sup>39</sup>*The Diplomas of King Aethelred 'the Unready' 978-1016: A Study of their Use as Historical Evidence* (Cambridge, 1980).

<sup>40</sup>E.g. *ECM*, pp. xix, 9.

<sup>41</sup>It is not clear whether there was a normal paradigm of the life of a royal chancery scribe at this period. Would he be a trained scribe from an episcopal or monastic scriptorium when he entered the king's service? If so, we could use his appearance in localized specimens to learn of the centres which contributed personnel to the staff of the royal secretariat. Would he continue to function, at least sporadically, as a member of the scriptorium of an ecclesiastical institution during his period of service with the king? Or would his term of royal service, if it did not lead to promotion, come to an end with the result that he then joined an ecclesiastical scriptorium? If so, his appearance in localized specimens would be less useful to us (unless we should suppose that he would return to the place where he entered religion). At present, we can answer none of these questions. Nor can we say whether the royal chancery trained its own new scribes, whether service there might be for life, or whether the chancery had a shifting population of trained scribes seconded from ecclesiastical scriptoria. Progress in dispelling ignorance depends on identifying the work of many charter-scribes in books.

<sup>42</sup>*ECM*, p. 15.

<sup>43</sup>*ECM*, pp. xix, xxi-xxii, xxiv.

<sup>44</sup>The only arguably Abingdon product of saec. x<sup>2</sup> would then be BL Cotton Tiberius A.vi, of 977/8, a vernacular manuscript written in Square miniscule. I hope to discuss the pre-Conquest history of the Abingdon scriptorium and library in another paper.

<sup>45</sup>In *The English Library before 1700: Studies in its History*, ed. Francis Wormald & C. E. Wright (London, 1958), pp. 15-31.

<sup>46</sup>Wormald and Wright, p. 16.

<sup>47</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

<sup>49</sup>For the Irish rules, the standard, if rather outdated, resource is by L. Gougaud, "Inventaire des règles monastiques irlandaises," *RB* 25 (1908): 167-84, 321-33, and 28 (1911) 86-9. There is a catalogue, still of use, by Haefen, *Disquisitiones Monasticae* (Antwerp, 1644), t. 1, tract. V, disq. XVI, p. 58, of pre-Benedictine western *Regulae*. See also Albers, *Untersuchungen zu den ältesten Mönchsgewohnheiten* (Munich, 1905), and the series of edited *Consuetudines Monasticae* which he initiated.

<sup>50</sup>I do not dissent from the conclusions of H. Mayr-Harting, *The Venerable Bede, the Rule of St. Benedict, and Social Class* (Jarrow,



(1977), but wish to see its important findings within the broadest context. Of the thoroughgoing Benedictinism of the tenth-century reform period the manuscript evidence leaves no doubt: we know already of twelve late Anglo-Saxon copies of the Rule (Gneuss, nos. 29, 41, 55, 101, 189, 248, 262, 379, 440, 672, 758, and 926), and an eighth-century copy which remained at Worcester (Gneuss, no. 631), as well as various copies of Smaragdus's relevant works.

<sup>51</sup>Wormald and Wright, p. 17.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>53</sup>"Bibliotheca: Bible et lecture du Careme d'apres saint Benoit," RB 60 (1950): 65-92.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., p. 67, n. 1, referring to M. Van Assche, "Divinae Vacare Lectioni, De Ratione Studiorum van Sint Benedictus," SE 1 (1948): 13-34 (at p. 25, n. 1). On this whole subject see further two important articles by K. Christ: "In Caput Quadragesimae," Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen 60 (1943): 33-59, and "Mittelalterliche Bibliotheksordnungen für Frauenklöster," ibid., 59 (1942): 1-29.

<sup>55</sup>Wormald and Wright, p. 27; Bishop, ECM, p. xvi; Ker, MLGB, pp. 81-5, and Catalogue, pp. xlii-xliii, xlv.

<sup>56</sup>The extensive glossing in the extraordinarily large group of manuscripts of Boethius, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, found in late Anglo-Saxon England, has recently been made the subject of a preliminary study by D. K. Bolton, "The Study of the Consolation of Philosophy in Anglo-Saxon England," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 44 (1977): 33-78. The manuscripts are Gneuss nos. 12, 23, 68, 193, 347 (OE), 408, 533, 643 (OE), 671, 678, 776, 823, 829, 886?, 887, 899, 901, 908.

<sup>57</sup>Ker, Catalogue, p. xlviii.

<sup>58</sup>On the Parker Chronicle, see M. B. Parkes, ASE 5 (1976): 149-71; on the Book of Armagh, Richard Sharpe, forthcoming in *Scriptorium*.

<sup>59</sup>Bishop, ECM, p. xv and n. 1.

<sup>60</sup>Preface to his translation of St. Gregory's "Pastoral Care." See the study by N. R. Ker, *The Pastoral Care...* (Copenhagen, 1956), a facsimile edition of the earliest manuscripts.

<sup>61</sup>CCCC, MS 183. I reject the ascription to Winchester, recently reaffirmed by Temple, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, pp. 37-8. See D. N. Dumville, "The Anglian Collection of Royal Genealogies and Regnal Lists," ASE 5 (1976): 23-50.

<sup>62</sup>J. A. Robinson, *The Times of Saint Dunstan* (Oxford, 1923), pp. 25-80 (esp. 51-71).

<sup>63</sup>H. E., 5.15, and *Praefatio*. For Aldfrith, see also Bede, *Historia Abbatum*, 15.

<sup>64</sup>"England in the Ninth Century: the Crucible of Defeat," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th Ser., 29 (1979): 1-20.

<sup>65</sup>In the preface to his "Pastoral Care," on the state of learning in England when he ascended the throne in 871.

<sup>66</sup>Ker, Catalogue, p. 381; Gneuss, no. 611.

<sup>67</sup>"Anglo-Saxon Art after Alfred," *Art Bulletin* 56 (1974) 176-200; "The Leofric Missal and Tenth-Century English Art," ASE 6 (1977): 145-73.

<sup>68</sup>See especially M. B. Parkes, "The Paleography of the Parker Manuscript of the Chronicle...", ASE 5 (1976): 149-71.

<sup>69</sup>Ker, MLGB, p. 200.

<sup>70</sup>In *The Tollemache Orosius* (British Museum Additional Manuscript 47967) (Copenhagen, 1953), p. 13, referring specifically to this, to CCCC 173, and to Hatton 20.

<sup>71</sup>An important study is that by T. A. M. Bishop, "An Early Example of the Square Minuscule," TCBS 4 (1964-8): 246-52; cf. his "The Corpus Martianus Capella," ibid., pp. 257-75.

<sup>72</sup>This view was expressed cautiously by C. Plummer, *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel* (2 vols. Oxford, 1892-9), 2: xxvii, but has been stated much more precisely by subsequent writers.

<sup>73</sup>The views summarized here are documented in my paper, "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Origins of English Square Minuscule Script," *Anglia*, forthcoming.

<sup>74</sup>Gneuss designates the following manuscripts as foreign: nos. 7, 19, 48, 70, 77, 81, 83, 87, 96, 105, 112, 119-20, 128, 133-7, 140, 148, 179, 211, 245, 263, 266, 279, 281, 283-4, 295, 297, 299, 311-12, 316-17, 334, 354, 361-2, 376, 384, 392, 409, 417-19, 423, 444, 459, 485-6, 489-90, 492, 512-13, 515-16, 521, 529-32, 538, 541, 557, 564-5, 570, 575, 581, 583, 585, 607, 629, 651, 654, 659, 661, 681, 688, 716, 744, 752, 754, 779, 794-5, 801, 804, 809, 834, 889, 908, 939, 944-5.

<sup>75</sup>I have given a preliminary list of early medieval Breton manuscripts as an appendix to my book cited in the next note.

<sup>76</sup>This whole movement is discussed in my O'Donnell lectures, *England and the Celtic World in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries* (publication forthcoming).

<sup>77</sup>See especially the papers by T. A. M. Bishop cited in n. 71 above. For a Welsh teacher at Winchester in Aethelwold's episcopacy, see M. Lapidge, ASE 1 (1972): 85-137.

<sup>78</sup>In addition to the papers of M. Lapidge cited in notes 9 and 12 above, see his "L'influence stylistique de la poésie de Jean Scot," in *Jean Scot Erigène et l'histoire de la philosophie* (Colloques du CNRS, 561 [Paris, 1977]) pp. 441-52.

<sup>79</sup>Gneuss, nos. 77, 140, 263, 490, 492, 939.

<sup>80</sup>Gneuss, nos. 311, 585, 661.



<sup>81</sup>Gneuss, nos. 334, 362. Nos. 423 and 809 are probably Lotharingian.

<sup>82</sup>Gneuss, nos. 70, 804. Nos. 112 and 516 are from Saint-Amand.

<sup>83</sup>*The English Church 1000-1066: A History of the Later Anglo-Saxon Church* (2nd ed., London, 1979), first published in 1963.

<sup>84</sup>ECM, pp. xi, xxiii.

<sup>85</sup>ECM, p. xviii.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE *Dicta Candidi*, *Dicta Albini*  
AND SOME RELATED TEXTS<sup>1</sup>

Christine E. Ineichen-Eder

In a recent article<sup>2</sup> I presented the first results of research on the contents of the *membra disiecta* of a ninth-century Breton manuscript found in Clm 18961 fols. 25-45, henceforth called B. This miscellaneous codex with school texts, saec. IX-XIII, has been in the monastery of Tegernsee at least since the eleventh century, as corrections made by Tegernsee scribes of that time in the Breton section indicate. The twenty-one folios deriving from Brittany contain a selection of excerpts from Augustine, Boethius, Chalcidius, and Seneca; most of the so-called *Dicta Candidi*; some unknown texts ascribed to the author of the *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei*; and an Alcuinian catechism which Benedict of Aniane had copied completely in his *Forma Fidei*. A further excerpt seems to have been taken from the commentary to Job by Philippus.<sup>3</sup> Thus far, I was able to show that this material is one of a group of typical school codices which contained *Lehrmaterial* from Alcuin's teaching on the continent. Among this group can also be counted: Munich, Clm 6407 (from Verona, ca. A.D. 800=V)<sup>4</sup>; Paris, Bibl. Nat. Lat. 13953, fol. 41v-46v (France, saec. X; provenance of the codex is Saint-Germain-des-Prés=G)<sup>5</sup>; Würzburg, U.B. Mp. theol. fol. 56 (fol. 33v-35v, from Würzburg, first half of the ninth century=W)<sup>6</sup>; and Vat. Reg. 1709 (at least fol. 18v-19r, from France, saec. IX=R)<sup>7</sup>; furthermore a manuscript from Salzburg, saec. IX, which Frobenius Forster had seen, but which is now lost.<sup>8</sup>

I now wish to present, as a continuation of the first paper,<sup>9</sup> a more detailed study of the *Dicta Candidi* and the two closely related texts (B, texts nos. 10 and 11), ascribed to the same author as the text *De Imagine Dei* (B, text no. 12) in the Breton manuscript.

*Insular Latin Studies*, ed. Michael Herren,  
Papers in Mediaeval Studies 1 (Toronto:  
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981)  
pp. 179-193



The *Dicta Candidi* were first discovered as a group of twelve texts by B. Hauréau in 1872<sup>10</sup> in the manuscript from Saint-Germain-des-Prés. The first text is entitled *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei*; the remaining texts have different headings and themes, such as *De Decem Categoriis Augustini*, *De Loco*, *De Tempore*, *Propter quid Homo Factus Sit*, etc. No mention of the name Candidus is made in these subsequent titles. At the end of this collection (G, fol. 46vb) an eighteenth-century hand had made the note: *Hactenus Candidus de imagine Dei*. This incorrect<sup>11</sup> subscription no doubt had encouraged Hauréau to publish all twelve texts under the title of *Dicta Candidi*.<sup>12</sup> In 1890, O. C. Th. Richter drew attention to the fact that *Dictum I (De Imagine Dei)* had been transmitted in the now lost ninth-century manuscript from Salzburg (=S) used by Frobenius Forster.<sup>13</sup>

Hauréau had tentatively identified Candidus, mentioned in the title of the first text, with Candidus-Brun of Fulda. This opinion was accepted by later scholars: F. Zimmerman<sup>14</sup> was led to believe that he had found further evidence for this view when he discovered that the text of *Dictum I* had just been published by E. Dümmler as an anonymous letter addressed to the emperor (with a note to Einhard asking him to check the correctness of the content).<sup>15</sup> Finally, Professor H. Löwe<sup>16</sup> discovered the *Dicta Candidi Presbyteri de Imagine Dei* together with the *Dicta Albini Diaconi de Imagine Dei* in the Verona manuscript that had been written around A.D. 800, under the supervision and participation of the archdeacon, Pacificus of Verona. Löwe made it plausible that the contents of this manuscript had been copied from a codex used in Alcuin's school and that the much discussed Candidus referred to in V and G could only be Candidus-Wizo, the Anglo-Saxon disciple of Alcuin.<sup>17</sup>

However, Löwe also expressed doubt about the authenticity of the twelve *Dicta*<sup>18</sup> for the following reasons: (1) only the title of the first *Dictum* mentions the name Candidus; (2) the *Dicta Candidi Presbyteri* and the *Dicta Albini Diaconi* have also been transmitted as one tractate entitled *De Dignitate Conditionis Humanae*, attributed to Ambrose;<sup>19</sup> and (3) in the *Libri Carolini*, the "*Dicta Albini*" have been quoted extensively as a work of Ambrose.<sup>20</sup>

With respect to (3), the following may at least be pointed out, though a final satisfactory solution to the entire question of the *Dicta Albini* has not yet been found. *Libri Carolini* 1, 7 contains a short introduction to the topic: *Quod non ad adorandas imagines pertineat,*

*quod scriptum est: Creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem suam.* Then follow two quotations attributed to Ambrose and Augustine. Both these excerpts are quite long. The entire citation from Augustine consists of his *De Diversis Questionibus*, ch. 51. The excerpt from Ambrose begins with a short quotation for his *De Fide*, 1, 7, but is then followed by a long excerpt from the *Dicta Albini* without any indication that a different author is being quoted. According to the structure of the chapter, it is quite obvious that the concise introduction was meant to be succeeded and confirmed by quotations from auctoritates, i.e., Ambrose and Augustine. The *Dicta Albini* are, in fact, absorbed into the quotation from Ambrose.<sup>21</sup> Since the *Libri Carolini* were written by Theodulf of Orléans,<sup>22</sup> it is hard to believe that he would misquote a work of Alcuin. Paul Meyvaert suggested that Theodulf may possibly have found Ambrose's *De Fide* 1, 7 already inflated by the so-called *Dicta Albini*.<sup>23</sup> Still unexplained is the question why and when the *Dicta Albini* were ascribed to Alcuin.<sup>24</sup> Löwe's suggestion<sup>25</sup> that they may have been presented orally by Alcuin, again, comes to mind.

Regarding (1), a number of observations are in order. In B, the Candidus text (G, no. 1) is simply headed by the words: *Item Eiusdem de Imagine Dei*. Two as yet unknown texts precede the supposed Candidus text and are also entitled *Item Eiusdem[sic]*, thus suggesting that all three texts originated from the same author. Of another text preceding this little groups of anonyma, only a very short fragment is left at the beginning of the gathering. Hence, the author's name has not been transmitted in B.

Since Hauréau's edition, the numeration of the *Dicta* has always followed the sequence of texts in G. V and B, however, give the texts in a different order, interspersed with other texts, while W contains only *Dicta* 1<sup>26</sup> and 2, R contains only *Dicta* 10 and 12. The order of texts in V is: 2, 10, 12, 4, 1, 9, 11, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8; the order of texts in B is: 1, 2, 6, 5, 7, 8, 4, 10 and 12 (*Dictum* 3 and *Dictum* 11 are omitted).

*Dictum* 2 is entitled in B, V, and G *De Decem Categoriis Augustini*; it is a correct copy of Augustine's *De Trinitate* 5.2.3 and 5.1.2 (in that order). In other words, the author, Augustine, has been named correctly and Candidus is not the author. In V and B, the *Dicta* are embedded in a collection of excerpts, quotations, and added explanations which are all copied in the same manner as the *Dicta Candidi* and the *Dicta Albini*. A simple heading designates the content of the passage



and indicates the author, when known.

In each of the twelve *Dicta* a different theological or philosophical question is addressed; whereas, in the *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei* (*Dictum* 1) and the *Dicta Albinii de Imagine Dei*, the same topic is discussed.

From this evidence it is obvious that we are not justified in naming all twelve *Dicta* as one single group of *Dicta Candidi*. The title *Dicta Candidi* can only have been intended for the first text (*De Imagine Dei*) just as the title *Dicta Albinii* was attached to one specific text only.

The remaining texts (G, 2-12)<sup>27</sup> can be divided into two groups: (1) short texts (nos. 2 and 4-8; among these should be included B, no. 25 = V, fol. 98r), to a great extent copied verbatim from an authority that gives definitions of basic philosophic concepts; and (2) longer texts (G, 3 and 9-12) intended to prove certain philosophic truths, based on the teachings of either Augustine or Claudianus Mamertus, but also showing the author's own philosophic development of those particular questions.

To group (1) belong the following texts: G 2, *De Decem Categoriis Augustini*, is, as shown above, a direct copy from St. Augustine; G 5, *Quomodo Quid Sit*, is taken verbatim from Claudianus;<sup>28</sup> the wording of the beginning of G 6, *De Substantia*, can be found in Isidore;<sup>29</sup> the text G 7, *De Loco*, is formulated independently but the central thought is obviously based on Claudianus;<sup>30</sup> text G 8, *De Tempore*, also phrased originally, seems to be primarily dependent on Augustin;<sup>31</sup> G 4 *Utrum Secundum Tempus an Secundum Excellentiam Deus est Ante Tempora*, although placed before texts 5-8 in G, really is a sequence to G 8 and is composed in accordance with Augustine;<sup>32</sup> text B 25, *De Loco Dei*, is again excerpted from Augustine.<sup>33</sup> Such short and general texts were most likely meant for memorization by students, and the teacher, who partly excerpted and partly phrased them himself, saw no need or justification for attaching his name to them.

Group (2) consists of these texts: G 3 *Si Possit Verum Esse Sine Veritate* is obviously dependent on Augustine<sup>34</sup> and Claudianus.<sup>35</sup> However, the author does not slavishly follow the thoughts of his predecessors, but develops his own argument to prove that truth itself is not a body.<sup>36</sup> G 9, *Propter Quid Homo Factus Sit*, shows that man's happiness consists in knowing the highest good, God. Knowledge of God is eternal life,<sup>37</sup> but in order to know God, one must first know God's image, man. Though

based on Augustine<sup>38</sup> and Claudianus,<sup>39</sup> the author expresses his own ideas on the topic. G 10, *Quomodo Sancta et Sempiterna atque Incommutabilis Sit Trinitas*, begins with a quotation from Augustine and then continues to explain in words different from those of Augustine and Claudianus the unity of, yet distinction between, *esse*, *nosse*, and *amare*; and of *essentia*, *sapientia*, and *caritas*.<sup>40</sup> At the end of the text, the author uses the word *inlocaliter* with reference to the soul, an expression in psychology which is particularly characteristic of Claudianus and may have been developed by him.<sup>41</sup> G 11, *Quemadmodum Probari Possit Esse Inlocaliter*, reveals in the title its debt to Claudianus. The introductory sentence *Quae superius esse, nosse atque amare nuncupavi*.... refers back directly to text 10. Thus we know that texts 10 and 11 were meant to be together, even though they are not always transmitted together or in that order. Only G gives them in the intended sequence. Text 11 combines, again, the doctrine of Augustine and Claudianus.<sup>42</sup> In G 12, *Quo Argumento Colligendum Sit Deum Esse*,<sup>43</sup> based like the previous texts on Augustine<sup>43</sup> and Claudianus,<sup>44</sup> expresses in shorter and more precise form the ideas that were the didactic aim of the religious catechism<sup>45</sup> transmitted together with these texts in G, V, and B. The two texts are so closely connected in content, though not in style and method, that one can only imagine that either one was the source of the other, or that both were composed simultaneously.

The study of the eleven texts edited by Hauréau (together with the *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei*) has shown that there is an underlying plan and a certain cohesion among these texts. The short ones, primarily excerpts (G 2 and 4-8 as well as B 25) establish basic concepts; the longer ones (G 3 and 9-12), based on Augustine and Claudianus, are written in a simple, dialectical, and precise style of language, and their vocabulary and sentence structure are alike. Hence, they may originate from the same author who refers to himself in text G 11. This hypothesis is confirmed, to a great extent, by the manuscript tradition, which shows that these texts are often transmitted together in a larger group (e.g., in V, B, and G), preferably in connection with the *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei*. The purpose of the collection was obviously to give students simple and concise guidelines for some of the basic metaphysical problems connected with the study of theology.

As mentioned above, the *Dicta de Imagine Dei*, ascribed to Alcuin, and those ascribed to Candidus are also transmitted as one single text attributed to Ambrose.<sup>46</sup> In this version the two texts are combined in



a single letter addressed by a teacher to his beloved student (*dulcissime fili*).<sup>47</sup> When one compares the redaction of the letter with that of the two *Dicta*, slight text variations are evident: e.g., some biblical quotations and the addresses to the student (in the letter) are missing in the two *Dicta*. The question of chronology necessarily arises.

The *Dicta Candidi* and the so-called *Dicta Albini* were promulgated at the continental school of Alcuin. The *terminus post quem* for the redaction of the *Dicta Candidi* is the year 793, when Candidus came to Alcuin's school at the royal palace for the first time. However, the transmission of the text of the *Dicta Albini* is older since the *Libri Carolini*, in which extensive sections of it are attributed to Ambrose,<sup>48</sup> were finished in 791. Later, between the years 798 and 814, Bishop Leidred of Lyons had a complete corpus of dialectical works copied from an Alcuinian school codex for his cathedral school;<sup>49</sup> among these texts were also the *Dicta Albini* and *Dicta Candidi* together, lacking, however, title and attribution (fol. 106v f.).

Obviously the text generally known as *Dicta Albini* and quoted in the *Libri Carolini* has the earliest tradition,<sup>50</sup> whereas the oldest manuscript transmission of the *Dicta Candidi* dates back to about 800 A.D. (in V), several years after the *Libri Carolini* had been completed. The combination of the two texts, though without title and author, occurred already in the very beginning of the ninth-century (in the Leidred Codex). The later attribution of this combined text to Ambrose was most likely promulgated by the ascription in the *Libri Carolini* or the textual source of *Libri Carolini* 1.37.

A study of the two *Dicta* reveals that they must have been written by two different people, so that also from this point of view the redaction of the *Dicta* must have preceded that of the letter.<sup>51</sup> The text of the *Dicta Albini* is based on the scriptural passage: *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram* (Gen. 1.26) and accordingly consists of two sections, one explaining man as the image of God, the other showing man's similitude to God. Both expositions are based on exegesis and emphasize the ethical nature of the soul and man's need to practise the virtues (here called *dignitates animae*) of charity, goodness, justice, patience, meekness, mercy, and cleanness of heart - a topic very dear to Alcuin. Hence an ascription of this text to Alcuin was not made without some justification.<sup>52</sup>

The *Dicta Candidi* (written from a strictly dialectical and metaphysical point of view) sound like a complement to the *Dicta Albini*.

The soul, the interior man, is discussed *qua* soul. It is called either *mens* or *anima*, depending on which of its functions the author refers to: that of knowing (*mens*) or that of vivifying the body (*anima*). Just as God's nature is threefold - He Who is (*ipse ex quo*), Wisdom (*sapientia*) begotten by Him, and Love (*dilectio*) with which He adhere to Wisdom (or: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost) - thus also the soul is threefold - the soul itself, i.e. substance (*mens*), the knowledge it conceives (*scientia*), and the love (*amor*) with which it is attached to its knowledge. The text reveals its debt to Augustine<sup>53</sup> and Claudianus.<sup>54</sup> Once the author uses the expression *in nostris scripturis* when he explains that love, *amor*, *id est caritas*, is the Holy Spirit; he is evidently placing the Christian writings in contrast to the Roman classics where the word *amor* has a different connotation. The author is writing within a typical school context. The language of this text is quite different from that of the other *Dicta*. The metaphysical thoughts are expressed in a very distinctive and differentiating language: e.g., whereas the author of the *Dicta Albini* uses the word *sapere* for God's as well as the soul's activity, the author of the *Dicta Candidi* differentiates *sapere*, God's activity, from *scire*, the soul's activity. Since the most important manuscripts attribute the text to Candidus, and no reason appears for doubting this attribution, we may indeed be justified in ascribing the text to Candidus-Wizo.<sup>55</sup>

The next question is whether Candidus can also be considered the author and compiler of texts G2-12 and B25, so often transmitted in connection with his *Dicta*. Manuscript tradition does not attribute them to him. However, there are several reasons for assuming that these texts (as a collection) also derived from Candidus:

1. The *Dicta Candidi* and the text collection are based primarily on the same sources, Augustine and Claudianus Mamertus, yet apart from the direct excerpts both also show the author's independent development of philosophical ideas. The author's own thoughts in the different texts are complementary, not contradictory.
2. There is unity of style in texts G3, 4, 7-12 and the *Dicta Candidi*. The style is much simpler than that of Augustine or Claudianus, but also lacks the gentleness and nobility of Alcuin's style. Instead, it is appropriate for the expression of a factual discourse on metaphysical questions. The syntax of the sentences is simple, dialectical, and similar in all texts. Certain choices of vocabulary place the author in the milieu of the Anglo-Saxon tradition.<sup>56</sup>
3. The underlying theme of all texts is that of incorporeity: if the soul were not incorporeal, it could not be the image of God who is incorporeal *par excellence*.<sup>57</sup>



With these considerations as a basis, one can assume that Candidus-Wizo was not only the composer of the *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei* but also the compiler of the collection of texts G 2-12 and B 25, some of which he most likely wrote himself.

Finally, the fragment and the two texts immediately preceding the *Dicta Candidi* in B<sup>58</sup> deserve special study. By the title *Item Eiusdem*, texts B10 and 11 and ascribed to the same author as the following *Dicta Candidi*, here entitled: *Item Eiusdem de Imagine Dei*. It is noteworthy that in B texts entitled with an author's name were generally attributed correctly. Consequently, we may assume that the designations *Item Eiusdem* are also used conscientiously. Apart from the fragment B 9<sup>59</sup> - an incomplete sentence that nevertheless reveals its dependence on St. Augustine<sup>60</sup> - the first of the two texts (B 10) is a rather short piece on the Trinity and is reminiscent of Augustine;<sup>61</sup> similar expressions are also found in Alcuin's *De Trinitate*.<sup>62</sup> The second text (B 11) is fairly long and treats of wisdom, *sapientia*, as the Son of God, the second person of the Trinity. The last part of B 11<sup>63</sup> is also found in V (fol. 118v) as an individual text, without designation of an author: it is an explanation of the unity in the Trinity found in corporeal and incorporeal substances and is based almost entirely on Claudianus<sup>64</sup> and the often cited passage, Sap. 11: 21.<sup>65</sup> This exposition may originally have been a separate text, as the other texts in G. The first part of B 11, however, shows dependence on Alcuin,<sup>66</sup> whereas its style is similar to that of B 10 as well as to the *Dicta Candidi*. Since the manuscript tradition attributes the texts B 10 and 11 (and by inference also B 9) to the author of the *Dicta Candidi*, the evidence suggests that they, too, were composed by Candidus-Wizo.

If these observations, inferences, and conclusions presented in this paper are correct, then we can say that Candidus-Wizo's role as a theologian is appearing in a new light.<sup>67</sup> Whereas previously we knew him only as Alcuin's pupil, friend and emissary, he is now emerging as a scholar of theology in his own right - and I may be permitted to state this with all the more certainty now that I have just shown that he (and not Candidus-Brun of Fulda) is also the author of the *Opusculum de Passione Domini* and of the letter *Num Christus Corporeis Oculis Deum Videre Potuerit*.<sup>68</sup>

From the material discussed in the present paper Candidus-Wizo's authorship can be claimed for the following smaller texts: *Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei* (G 1 = B 12 = V, fol. 100v), *Si Possit Verum Esse Sine*

*Veritate* (G 3 = V, fol. 103r), *Utrum Secundum Tempus an Secundum Excellentiam Deus Est Ante Tempora* (G 4 = B 26 = V, fol. 98r), *De Loco* (G 7 = B 23 = V, fol. 104r), *De Tempore* (G 8 = B 24 = V, fol. 104r), *Propter Quid Homo Factus Sit* (G 9 = B 30 = V, fol. 102v), *Quomodo Sancta et Sempiterna atque Incommutabilis Sit Trinitas* (G 10 = B 27 = V, fol. 94r), *Quemadmodum Probari Possit Esse Inlocaliter* (G 11 = V, fol. 102v), *Quo Argumento Colligendum Sit Deum Esse* (G 12 = B 28 = V, fol. 94v); as well as for the texts B 10 and 11 (on the Trinity and divine wisdom), which have no other title than *Item Eiusdem*, and for the fragment B 9 (only the ending of B 11 is transmitted also in V, fol. 118v, beginning with: *Nulla est unitas...*). Each of these texts discusses only one particular problem in short and succinct language, as is appropriate for school purposes. Although the author bases his ideas on the works of his predecessors in theology, particularly Augustine and Claudianus Mamertus, as well as Alcuin, he presents the ideas in most cases in a new garment as it were: not only is his style of language different from that of previous theologians, but he sees and solves problems in the light of the theological issues of the time of Charlemagne. In other words, he opens up new dimensions for old problems. The same may be said of the other two works by Candidus-Wizo, the *Opusculum* and the letter, mentioned above. Although these are not written for school purposes - the *Opusculum* is for a group of brethren living together in some form of community; the letter is an answer to a specific theological question raised by someone rather advanced in theological thinking - they betray the same characteristics as the shorter articles written as "Lehrmaterial": (1) the dialectical and metaphysical (rather than allegorical and analogical) approach to theological questions; (2) the obvious influence from the works of Augustine, Claudianus Mamertus, and Alcuin; (3) the Carolingian set of "glasses" through which the problems are seen; and (4) the simple and straightforward style of language.

The use of Claudianus' work *De Statu Animae* is rather a significant earmark for all of Candidus' works. Since that text was not very widely disseminated,<sup>69</sup> Candidus-Wizo may have been one of the first scholars in Carolingian times to have made such extensive use of Claudianus' text and he may have been instrumental in making that text a little more popular. Finally it should be said that in future research, Candidus-Wizo deserves more attention than he has hitherto received; it may well be that further works (e.g. sermons) or aspects of his activities may yet come to light.



## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>As I was preparing this paper for the York Conference on Insular Latin I found out that John Marenbon, then a doctoral student of Professors Peter Dronke and Michael Lapidge, had also recently been working on this topic, though within a larger frame of reference (*From Alcuin to Eriugena*). My own researches go as far back as 1965, but I could not start to publish until 1978 (see n. 2). Supported by the special encouragement of Professor Dronke, I did not withdraw my paper from the conference. Later on J. Marenbon sent me that section of his dissertation that deals with the *Dicta Candidi*. We saw that our conclusions regarding the origin of the *Dicta* were quite different. I had thought that the texts in question belonged to an earlier period, whereas J. Marenbon ascribed them to Candidus-Wizo, the disciple of Alcuin. Prompted by our differences and by critical and interested questions expressed by the conference members, I reconsidered the problems once more and was finally convinced that I did not have sufficient evidence for my thesis and that, consequently, I could only agree basically with Marenbon's conclusion. I am now presenting the same material with a somewhat different perspective and with a few more details. Marenbon's thesis, *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre: Studies in the Use of Logic by the Philosophers of the Early Middle Ages*, will be published by the Cambridge University Press, presumably in 1981.

<sup>2</sup>C. E. Ineichen-Eder, "Theologisches und philosophisches Lehrmaterial aus dem Alkuin Kreis," *Deutsches Archiv* 34 (1978): 192-201 (henceforth cited as: *Lehrmaterial*). In this article I had announced (n. 51) that I would present a more detailed study on the *Dicta Candidi* together with a new edition of the texts. The present article is a partial fulfilment of the proposed study; the texts will now be edited by J. Marenbon in connection with his thesis, in a broader context.

<sup>3</sup>For a detailed description of contents (texts numbered 1-30), see *Lehrmaterial*, pp. 194-97. In a letter of January 1979, Marenbon informed me that text no. 13 was taken from Augustine, *De Civ. Dei* 22.20.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. B. Bischoff, *Die Südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit*, 2nd ed. (Wiesbaden, 1960) p. 149f. and H. LÖwe, "Zur Geschichte Wizos," *Deutsches Archiv* 6 (1943): pp. 363-73 (henceforth cited as: *Wizo*).

<sup>5</sup>L. Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits latins conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale sous les numéros 8823-18613* (1863-1871), p. 123f.; and B. Haureau, *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique* (1872), 1:133ff. Paleographical dating was received orally from Professor B. Bischoff in 1970.

<sup>6</sup>B. Bischoff and J. Hofmann, *Libri S. Kyliani* (Würzburg, 1952), pp. 18, 32f. and 127f.

<sup>7</sup>My sincere thanks are due to John Contreni, who was so kind as to inform me of this MS and who also gave me his photocopies of fols. 16r-23v, which contain texts B 27 and 28. The Reginensis apparently contains fragments from Fleury; cf. E. Dümmler, "Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der lateinischen Dichtung aus der Zeit der Karolinger, III," *Neues Archiv* 4 (1878-1879): 532.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. PL 101: 1316 and LÖwe, *Wizo*, p. 363 f.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. *Lehrmaterial*, p. 200, n. 51.

<sup>10</sup>See above, n. 5.

<sup>11</sup>Only *Dictum* 1 discusses the theme *De Imagine Dei*.

<sup>12</sup>Had he known of their different transmissions in other Carolingian manuscripts, he would most probably have come to a different conclusion.

<sup>13</sup>Cf. above, n. 8. See also Frobenius Forster, *Opera Alcuini* (1777), 2: 596.

<sup>14</sup>"Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Frühscholastik," *Divus Thomas* 7 (1929): 30-60. Further literature on the *Dicta Candidi* in *Lehrmaterial*, p. 193, no. 10. See also F. Brunhölzl, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, (1975), 1: 287f. and 549.

<sup>15</sup>MGH *Epistolae*, 5: 615f.

<sup>16</sup>Cf. above, n. 4.

<sup>17</sup>*Wizo*, p. 364f.

<sup>18</sup>*Wizo*, p. 370.

<sup>19</sup>PL 17: 1105-1108. Another late medieval tradition attributes the same text to Augustine under the title *De Creatione Primi Homini* (PL 100: 565; LÖwe, *Wizo*, p. 369, n. 1).

<sup>20</sup>*Libri Carolini* 1.7 (MGH *Legum Sectio* 3, *Concilia* 2, Suppl., pp. 22f.).

<sup>21</sup>It should be remembered that Ambrose, in his *Hexameron* 6.7.40 - 6.10.76 (ed. C. Schenkl, 1897, CSEL 32: 231-261) gave a long exposition on the very topic of the *Dicta Albin*. Since the *Dicta Albin* do indeed express some of his thoughts, e.g., that the virtues, particularly sapientia and iustitia, reveal the image of God, an attribution of the text of the *Dicta Albin* to Ambrose was not entirely far-fetched. Marenbon first interpreted the text of the *Dicta Albin* as "authorial commentary and expansion" in the *Libri Carolini* (ch. 2: "Logic and Theology at the Palace School of Charlemagne"), but he communicated to me that he has now been convinced through Paul Meyvaert's "Observations" in RB 89 (1979): 29-57, that "there really is no case for thinking Alcuin the author of the *Libri Carolini*."

<sup>22</sup>Cf. A. Freeman, "Further Studies in the *Libri Carolini* III: The Marginal Notes in Vaticanus Latinus 7207 *Speculum* 46 (1971): 597-612. See also below, n. 50.



<sup>23</sup>In a letter dated May 2, 1980, P. Meyvaert kindly answered my doubts regarding the authorship of the *Dicta Albini* with the following explanations: "The author of L. C. clearly thought he was presenting a single, long, uninterrupted quotation from Ambrose... It seems obvious that the source used by the L. C. author already had the conflation of Ambrose *De Fide* I, 7 and *Dicta "X" de Imagine Dei*. Would Theodulf or the court correctors of the Vatican MS [Vatic. Lat. 7207] have been unaware that L. C. 1, 7 was citing Alcuin? I find this hard to believe... Alcuin knew and used the *Dicta "X" de Imagine Dei*... but the *Dicta "X" de Imagine Dei* uses a very distinctive vocabulary to designate the faculties of the soul (intellect, memory and will) as the *dignitates animae*... it is also striking that this does not appear to be Alcuin's own vocabulary." I wish to take this opportunity to express special thanks to Paul Meyvaert for having considered this question in such detail. He has, moreover, promised to give this problem special attention in his further studies on the *Libri Carolini* and on Alcuin.

<sup>24</sup>It should be mentioned that parts of the *Dicta Albini* have also been cited anonymously as part of a letter of Pope Anacletus in the *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae* (ed. P. Hinschius, 1863, p. 72, Ep. 1, par. 13) - a reference from Professor B. Bischoff from 1971. Just as texts G 12 (=B 28) and B 29, the religious catechism (cf. *Lehrmaterial* p. 197, nn. 32 and 33), so also the *Dicta Albini* were later quoted in the *Monumenta Fidei* by Benedict of Aniane. Cf. J. Leclercq, "Les 'Monimenta Fidei' de Saint Benoît d'Aniane," *Studia Anselmiana* 20, (1948) p. 36.9; p. 37.40: *Primo quidem quia sicuti Deus unus semper ubique totus est... quo praesentem eum non habeat memoria*. (PL 100: 566B - 567B.). I owe this reference to P. Meyvaert in 1980.

<sup>25</sup>Wizo, p. 368.

<sup>26</sup>It is absorbed into an anonymous letter; see above n. 15.

<sup>27</sup>Henceforth, I shall use the name *Dicta* only for the two texts ascribed to Candidus and "Alcuin" and refer to the others simply as texts of G (counted according to Hauréau's edition), B (counted according to my enumeration in *Lehrmaterial*, pp. 194-197) or V (as described in Wizo, pp. 368-370).

<sup>28</sup>*De Statu Animae* 3.3. Most of the references to Claudianus were already pointed out by Zimmerman, "Beitrag" (see n. 14), pp. 57ff. The text G 5 is also cited in the supplement to the *Monumenta Fidei* (cf. Leclercq, p. 53).

<sup>29</sup>*Etymologiae* 2.26.6. Text G 6 is also found in the supplement to the *Monumenta Fidei* (cf. Leclercq, p. 54). The explicit given in *Lehrmaterial*, p. 197, should read: *non illa in aliis vel de aliis*.

<sup>30</sup>*De Statu Animae* 2.5.

<sup>31</sup>*Confessiones* 11.13-27. A similar thought, probably based in Augustine, is found in Claudianus, *De Statu Animae* 2.2. The five definitions of G 2 and G 5-8 are, of course, discussed in Boethius, *In Categorias Aristotelis* 1 and 2.

<sup>32</sup>*Confessiones* 11.13-27.

<sup>33</sup>*De Diversis Quaestionibus* 1.20. Quoted in *Libri Carolini* 1.27. Cf. Löwe, Wizo, p. 369.

<sup>34</sup>*De Diversis Quaestionibus* 1.9: *Utrum corporeis sensibus percipi veritas possit*.

<sup>35</sup>*De Statu Animae* 1.14: *Spiritualia corporeis oculis videri non posse: ibid., 3.9: Quod multum distet inter visionem oculorum et visionem animae, esp. par. 2*. See also below n. 68.

<sup>36</sup>The nature of the proof is such that I wonder if the title has been transmitted correctly (B, G, and V do show many scribal errors) and it should not perhaps read: *Si possit corpus verum esse sine veritate*.

<sup>37</sup>Jo. 17.3.

<sup>38</sup>Cf. *Confessiones* 13.22.31; *Soliloquia* 1.3.

<sup>39</sup>*De Statu Animae* 1.27.

<sup>40</sup>The quotation is taken from Augustine, *De Civ. Dei* 11.26 (CSEL 40: 550). The entire text shows dependence on Augustine, *De Civ. Dei* 11.26-28; idem, *De Trin.* 6.5; and Claudianus, *De Statu Animae* 3.3, 14. Cf. *Dicta Albini*, PL 100: 566.

<sup>41</sup>Cf. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* VII, 1, 1 (1934-64), col. 386. See also A. Engelbrecht, "Untersuchungen über die Sprache des Claudianus Mamertus," *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 110 (1885): 423-542.

<sup>42</sup>Augustine, *De Trin.* 10; *De Civ. Dei* 10.27. Claudianus, *De Statu Animae* 1.24.26; 2.6. The word *consilium* (instead of *intellectus* or *notitia*) points particularly to Claudianus as source.

<sup>43</sup>*De Libero Arbitrio* 2.3. Cf. Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* 2.6.16 (Brunhölzl, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 1: 228).

<sup>44</sup>*De Statu Animae* 2.2.

<sup>45</sup>Cf. *Lehrmaterial*, p. 199f. The catechism will also be edited by John Marenbon in the above mentioned thesis.

<sup>46</sup>See above, n. 19.

<sup>47</sup>The *Dicta Albini* constitute ch. 1, the beginning of ch. 2, and the entire ch. 3 of the letter; the *Dicta Candidi* make up the rest of ch. 2 (PL 17: 1105 [inc.]): *Et ideo, dilectissime fili, juste mihi videtur... (Expl., ibid., col. 1107): Haec de imagine, o dilectissime fili, habeto*.

<sup>48</sup>See above nn. 20, 21, and 23.

<sup>49</sup>Cf. L. Delisle, *Notices et extraits* 35, 2 (1897): 834; B. Bischoff, "Die Hofbibliothek Karls des Grossen," in: *Karl der Grosse, 2: Des Geistige Leben*, ed. B. Bischoff (1965), p. 48; idem in: *Karl der Grosse, Werk und Wirkung* (Aachen, 1965), catalogue no. 363.



<sup>50</sup>Cf. A. Freeman, "Further Studies in the *Libri Carolini*: I. Paleographical Problems in Vaticanus Latinus 7207; II. 'Patristic Exegesis, Mozarabic Antiphons, and the Vetus Latina,'" *Speculum* 40 (1965): 203-289, esp. 219f., re MS transmission. See also n. 22.

<sup>51</sup>J. Marenbon has pointed out that only in late medieval manuscripts is the composite letter *De Dignitate Conditionis Humanae* attributed to Ambrose. As in the Leidrad Codex, the MS Stuttgart, Landbibliothek, HB VII, 48 (saec. XI/XII) contains on fols. 55v-57v the *De Dignitate Conditionis Humanae*, though without an author's name. Cf. *Die Handschriften der Württembergischen Landesbibliothek Stuttgart*, 2.3. *Codices Iuridici et Politici: Patres*, described by J. Autenrieth (Wiesbaden, 1963), p. 193.

<sup>52</sup>The main source for this text is obviously Augustine: *De Trin.* 6; 9.2ff; 10.4-5, 7, 10, 11; *De Genesi ad Litt.* 3.19-24; 7. As mentioned before in n. 21, Ambrose, *Hexameron* 6.7.40ff., is another source for the text. Cf. Cassiodorus, *De Anima* ch. 2.

<sup>53</sup>The entire text shows dependence on Augustine's *De Trin.* 6 (esp. 3-5); 7.4, 7; 9 (esp. 2-5 and 12); and 12; see also *De Civ. Dei* 11.24 and 14.7.

<sup>54</sup>*De Statu Animae* 1.24, 26.

<sup>55</sup>Candidus-Wizo (or Witto) had been a student of Bishop Hygbald of Lindisfarne before he came to Alcuin in A. D. 793. On his life see Löwe, *Wizo*, p. 365 ff. and Marenbon (ch. 2). See also Ineichen-Eder, "Candidus (Wizo, Witto, <H>witto)," in: *Lexikon des Mittelalters* and below, n. 68.

<sup>56</sup>E.g., when the late antique authors compared the different stages of created beings - non-living, animals, and humans - they invariably used the word *pecus* for animal. Bede and Alcuin as well as Candidus used the word *bestia* in this context.

<sup>57</sup>The topic of incorporeity seems to vibrate through the entire collection of texts: the nature of the soul or of God, of truth, of place or time, as well as the question of whether God exists are discussed. The theme of man as the image of God (based on Gen. 1: 26f. and 2:7) was discussed at some length by all church fathers. The assertion of Faustus of Riez, that the soul is corporeal, brought forth strong counter-statements, among which the treatise of Claudianus Mamertus in the fifth century is rather outstanding. The *De Anima* of Cassiodorus was not used by the author of the *Dicta*, probably because it was not as simple, dialectical, and metaphysically oriented in its approach as the work of Claudianus.

<sup>58</sup>B, texts 9-11 (fols. 31r-33v).

<sup>59</sup>Since it precedes a text entitled *Item Eiusdem*, it naturally follows that it was attributed to the same author (as the following text).

<sup>60</sup>*De Trin.* 7.3.6; 15-17, 27ff.

<sup>61</sup>*De Trin.* 15.19, 36.

<sup>62</sup>Alcuin, *De Trin.*, esp. 2.19.

<sup>63</sup>(Inc.) *Nulla unitas est in qua trinitas <non> inveniatur* (B, fol. 33r).

<sup>64</sup>*De Statu Animae* 2.4-6; 1.7, 13, 15.

<sup>65</sup>*Mensura, numero et pondere omnia disposuisti*. The last two sentences of the exposition sound more like glosses or marginal notes.

<sup>66</sup>Alcuin, *De Trin.* 2.14.

<sup>67</sup>J. Marenbon gives great tribute to the work of Candidus-Wizo, stating that he "must be considered pre-eminent among the philosophers of Charlemagne's court" (see ch. 2).

<sup>68</sup>See my recent article: "Künstlerische und literarische Tätigkeit des Candidus-Brun von Fulda," which will appear in *Fuldaer Geschichtsblätter* (1981), and in which I have given preliminary evidence for the fact that only Candidus-Wizo could have been the author of the two works. A simplified version without footnotes of the same has just appeared in *Hrabanus Maurus und Seine Schule. Festschrift der Hrabanus-Maurus-Schule* 1980, ed. W. Böhne (Fulda, 1980), pp. 182-92.

<sup>69</sup>According to M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 1 (1911), Claudianus Mamertus was used by Micon of St. Riquier (p. 471, n. 2), Paulus Albarus of Cordova (p. 424), and Samson of Cordova (p. 430). In library catalogues Claudianus is listed in a ninth-century catalogue in Lorsch; cf. G. Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui* (1885), no. 37 - regarding the date see B. Bischoff, *Lorsch im Spiegel seiner Handschriften* (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissanceforschung, Beiheft, 1974), p. 8ff. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries *De Statu Animae* is found also in Trier, Bec and Prüfening; cf. Becker, *Catalogi*, nos. 76, 86, 95, and 127. Regarding Prüfening see now C. E. Ineichen-Eder, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge* vol. 4, ed. B. Bischoff (1977), part I: "Bistümer Passau und Regensburg," p. 424. For his edition of Claudianus' *De Statu Animae*, A. Engelbrecht (CSEL 11 [1885]: 1ff.) found several manuscripts of the ninth and/or tenth century: Paris Lat. 16340 and 2779, Einsiedeln 318, St. Gall 846, and Vatic. Reg. 201 (saec. IX, according to A. Wilmart, *Cod. Reg. Lat.* I [1937], 1:477. These listings show sufficiently that the text of Claudianus was available in some places in the early Middle Ages but does not seem to have been very popular.



LES VIES DE SAINTS BRETONS LES PLUS ANCIENNES DANS LEURS RAPPORTS  
AVEC LES ILES BRITANNIQUES

François Kerlouégan

Université de Besançon

Les Vies de saints bretons les plus anciennes - c'est-à-dire antérieures à l'exode des reliques et du clergé devant les invasions normandes au Xe siècle, ce qui correspond en gros à la fin de la période carolingienne - forment un ensemble important à la fois par leur nombre et par leur date et de ce fait occupent une place de choix dans le groupe des Vies celtiques.<sup>1</sup> Pourtant, si leur édition, commencée au XVIIe siècle par Albert Le Grand, continuée au XVIIIe siècle par Dom Lobineau, a été reprise autour des années 1900 par La Borderie, Ferdinand Lot, Robert Fawtier et quelques autres, si leur étude scientifique a connu un développement certain avec des derniers érudits, auxquels il faut joindre à la première place le chanoine François Duine, elles semblent ensuite être plus ou moins retombées dans un oubli qu'elles ne méritent pas, encore que depuis une quinzaine d'années l'attention des spécialistes se porte à nouveau sur elles. Depuis 1925 en effet, date du livre de R. Largillière, *Les saints et l'organisation chrétienne primitive de l'Armorique bretonne*, il faut surtout signaler quelques travaux de chanoine Doble, en particulier sur Paul Aurélien,<sup>2</sup> puis en 1966 un article de synthèse de P. Riché sur les premiers hagiographes bretons,<sup>3</sup> un chapitre d'E. G. Bowen dans *Saints, Seaways and Settlements in the Celtic Lands* en 1969,<sup>4</sup> un article de F. Morvannou sur "Guénolé et Guénaél" en 1974,<sup>5</sup> et un article de Québécois Joseph-Claude Poulin intitulé "Hagiographie et politique: La Première Vie de Saint Samson de Dol" en 1977.<sup>6</sup> Remarquons au passage que ce sont surtout des historiens qui se sont jusqu'ici intéressés aux Vies et que les latinistes brillent encore par leur absence.

La recherche dans ce domaine reste donc largement ouverte. Aussi, puisque le thème proposé à la Conférence concerne les Iles, je voudrais



relever dans les Vies toutes les indications, directes ou indirectes, qui s'y rapportent (personnes, lieux, usages) et montrer par la conjonction de ces notations de valeur diverse que cette série de documents confirme l'existence des liens qui pendant tout le haut Moyen Age, comme nous le savons par d'autres sources, unissaient les Bretons du Continent à leurs frères de Grande-Bretagne et à leurs cousins irlandais.

Dans my première partie, je m'arrêterai sur les saints venus des Iles, c'est-à-dire sur ce que les auteurs des Vies nous disent de leur terre d'origine, de leur famille, de leurs lieux de séjour, de leurs déplacements.

Ensuite je m'attacherai aux rédacteurs des Vies en question: comment se sont-ils informés sur la partie insulaire de la vie de leur saint? que nous disent-ils plus généralement sur les Iles?

Enfin je montrerai que les Vies font apparaître, chez les Bretons du haut Moyen Age, certains traits de civilisation et de culture qui se rattachent nettement à l'ensemble insulaire.<sup>7</sup>

\*

\*      \*

Puisqu'il s'agit de récits à prétention biographique, il est normal que nous nous occupions d'abord du héros de chacune de ces Vies. Sur les dix saints présentés dans les quatorze textes recensés, six nous intéressent ici puisqu'ils sont d'origine insulaire: Guénolé, Magloire, Malo, Paul Aurélien, Samson et Tudual. Je leur adjoindrai Guénaél, saint continental qui a voyagé dans les Iles.

Trois de ces Vies sont d'auteur connu. Celle de Guénolé a été écrite à Landévenec après 857 par le moine Clément et amplifiée par l'abbé Wrdisten avant 884.<sup>8</sup> Celle de Paul est due à Wrmonoc, disciple d'Wrdisten, qui date son oeuvre de 884.<sup>9</sup> Quant à celle de Malo, nous en avons une version de Bili, clerc d'Alet, écrite dans la seconde moitié du IXe siècle.<sup>10</sup>

Trois ont été rédigées par des anonymes localisables: la Vie de Magloire, par un moine de Lehon, dans la seconde moitié du IXe siècle ou plutôt au début de Xe siècle;<sup>11</sup> celle de Tudual, par un moine de Tréguier, après 884;<sup>12</sup> la *Vita prima* de Samson enfin, due à un moine de Dol mais dont la date reste aujourd'hui encore discutée et comprise dans une fourchette allant de 610-615 à la première moitié du IXe siècle.<sup>13</sup> Inversement la *vita secunda* se situe dans la seconde moitié

de ce siècle mais pour Duine son auteur est un Dolois, pour Fawtier, un moine de Pental, en Neustrie.<sup>14</sup>

Quant aux deux dernière Vies, elles sont l'une et l'autre d'un anonyme de localisation non précisée. Il s'agit de la Vie de Guénaél, successeur de Guénolé à Landévenec, de la seconde moitié du IXe siècle ou du milieu de Xe siècle<sup>15</sup> et de la Vie de Malo par l'Anonyme, de la seconde moitié du IXe siècle.<sup>16</sup>

Cette présentation faite, venons-en à l'origine de nos saints. Samson est né (in) *Demetiana patria*, c'est-à-dire dans le Dyfed. Son père, Amon, est lui-même originaire de cette province; sa mère, Anna, vient d'une région plus difficile à identifier, probablement plus à l'Est. Tous les deux appartiennent à une famille noble.<sup>17</sup>

Magloire est doublement le cousin de Samson. Son père, Umbraphel, est en effet le frère cadet d'Amon et sa mère, Afrella, la soeur cadette d'Anna. Mais son biographe ne nous dit rien de précis sur le lieu de sa naissance, sinon qu'il s'agit de la Bretagne transmarine.<sup>18</sup>

C'est d'une région appelée Uuenti, c'est-à-dire Gwent, qu'est originaire Malo. Son père a nom Uuento; c'est un noble, fondateur de Guinicastrum. Par sa mère, Deruuela, il est le cousin des précédents, puisqu'elle est la soeur de leurs pères. On nous précise même le lieu de sa naissance: *in ualle quae dicitur Caruanna*, dit l'Anonyme, *in ualle quae dicitur Nantcaruan*, écrit Bili: c'est Nantcarvan, aujourd'hui Llancarfan.<sup>19</sup>

Paul, d'après Wrmonoc, est le fils d'un *comes* nommé Perphirius et il est né dans la presqu'île de Penn Ohen, à l'ouest de Cardiff. Mais Wrmonoc nous dit aussi que ses huit frères et ses trois soeurs sont élevés à Brehant *dincat (guttur receptaculi pugnae)*.<sup>20</sup> La chanoine Doble a montré qu'Wrmonoc a confondu deux personnages au nom voisin: un Paulus de Penychen et un saint Paulinus de Carmarthen.<sup>21</sup> Quoi qu'il en soit, il s'agit bien d'un saint gallois.

De Tudual, nous savons seulement qu'il est le fils de Pompaia, soeur d'un *comes* de Grande-Bretagne nommé Rigualus qui émigra en Bretagne et que Tudual prit le même chemin.<sup>22</sup> Notons que la *Vita secunda*, de XIe siècle, en fait un Irlandais.<sup>23</sup>

Guénolé est le seul des six à ne pas être né dans l'île. Mais son père, Fracanus, cousin du roi Catouius, est originaire de Domnonée et il émigre avec sa femme Alba Trimamma (Gwen Teirbron) et ses deux fils en Bretagne, où naîtra le petit Guénolé.<sup>24</sup>



Dès que leur intelligence est suffisamment ouverte - et cela se produit évidemment très tôt - les *sancti pueri* sont confiés à un moine non moins saint en vue de leur éducation.

Le plus fameux de ces maîtres, celui auquel on attribue le plus d'élèves, est Iltut. Ainsi Wrmonoc nous apprend que le jeune Paul fréquente son école avec trois autres saints fameux, Samson, dont nous savons déjà par son biographe qu'il a été le disciple du maître, Dewi et Gildas, auxquels il faut joindre Magloire, si nous en croyons le moine de Lehon.<sup>25</sup> Malo, lui, est élevé par l'Irlandais Brendan et aura l'humeur aussi voyageuse.<sup>26</sup>

Où se trouvent ces écoles? Brendan enseigne dans le monastère qu'il dirige et qui se trouve à Nantcarvan même.<sup>27</sup> L'école d'Iltut est plus difficile à situer. Le moine de Dol ne nous dit rien à ce sujet mais Wrmonoc la place dans l'île de Pyrus, *Demetarum patriae in finibus* (l'île de Caldy actuelle),<sup>28</sup> ce qui entre en contradiction avec le fait que Samson, trouvant le monastère d'Iltut trop bruyant, se retire dans celui du saint prêtre Pirus.<sup>29</sup> Il est probable qu'Wrmonoc a confondu Caldy avec Llanilltud Fawr, où on localise traditionnellement l'école d'Iltut.<sup>30</sup>

Leur éducation terminée, nos saints prennent leur essor. Nous voyons Samson se retirer à Caldy, en quête de tranquillité. Mais son père malade le fait appeler. En cours de route il traverse une forêt où se situe l'épisode de la *theomacha*.<sup>31</sup> Il revient ensuite à Caldy pour y trouver l'évêque Dubricius qui le fait élire abbé à la mort de Pirus.<sup>32</sup> Cette fois ce sont des moines irlandais retour de Rome qu'il suit dans l'île verte, où il séjourne quelque temps.<sup>33</sup> Rentré à Caldy, il refuse de reprendre la direction du monastère et se retire au désert, *iuxta Abrinum flumen*.<sup>34</sup> Mais voici que le synode de la province le rappelle. Il est nommé abbé d'un monastère fondé par saint Germain (peut-être Llanilltud Fawr) et sacré évêque.<sup>35</sup> La nuit de Pâques, un ordre céleste lui enjoint de partir. Après une visite aux fondations de sa mère et de sa tante, il arrive, *prospero nauigio*, dans un monastère nommé Docco, sur la côte nordouest de la Cornouailles, dans le *pagus Tricurius*. Là, le moine Winniau lui demande de répandre la bonne parole dans le voisinage. Sa mission accomplie, Samson passe enfin en Bretagne avec son cousin, le fils d'Afrella,<sup>36</sup> c'est-à-dire Magloire, dont le moine de Lehon nous apprend seulement qu'après quelques années passées auprès d'Iltut il suit Samson outre mer.<sup>37</sup>

Paul voyage également. A seize ans, il se retire au désert, vraisemblablement à Llanddeusant.<sup>38</sup> Le roi Marc (Quonomorius) l'invite alors auprès de lui, *in villa Bannhedos* (Caer Bannhed, peut-être Castel Dore en Cornouailles du sud).<sup>39</sup> Puis, pour suivre l'appel de l'Evangile, il décide de partir pour la Bretagne. Après une visite à sa soeur Sitofolla à Paul in Penwith, il s'embarque à Mount Bay ou aux îles Scilly et aborde à l'île d'Ossa (Ushand), c'est-à-dire Ouessant, à l'ouest de la Bretagne.<sup>40</sup>

Avec Malo nous rencontrons une autre tradition, celle des grands voyages sur mer, des *Imrama* irlandais, dont Brendan est l'un des héros. Le jeune Malo s'embarque une première fois à la recherche de l'île d'Ima, réputée pour être un Paradis terrestre.<sup>41</sup> Ce voyage échoue mais Malo, élu évêque, repart un quêté de l'île merveilleuse. Il aborde sur une terre où il ressuscite un géant païen qui s'offre à le guider et traîne le navire. Mais la tempête l'oblige à faire demi-tour. Le géant meurt dans l'île et c'est pendant le retour en Grande-Bretagne que Malo célèbre la messe sur le dos d'un cétacé.<sup>42</sup> A peine rentré, il annonce à ses parents son intention de quitter sa patrie et, traversant la Manche, il aborde à l'île du moine Aaron, site du Saint-Malo actuel.<sup>43</sup>

Un mot pour terminer sur les voyages dans les îles des saints berrons qui n'y sont pas nés, Guénolé et Guénaél. Le premier désire vivement s'embarquer pour l'Irlande, nous y reviendrons, mais une apparition de Patrice l'en dissuade.<sup>44</sup> C'est son successeur, Guénaél, qui visita la Grande-Bretagne et l'Irlande. Dans chaque île, il fonda un monastère d'une beauté merveilleuse, celui de Grande-Bretagne l'emportant sur l'autre, et il gagna à la règle de Landévenec et à son patronage cinquante communautés.<sup>45</sup>

Voilà donc, sommairement présentée, la contribution des Vies à la connaissance des saints bretons qui ont passé la première partie de leur existence dans les îles ou qui y ont séjourné en venant du Continent. Elle n'est pas négligeable. En effet ces Vies, dont une bonne moitié remonte à la seconde partie du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle, sont plus anciennes non seulement que les Vies galloises et corniques, mais aussi que la plupart des Vies irlandaises, sans compter les autres documents. Leurs auteurs connaissaient déjà des traditions vénérables que nous retrouverons plus tard dans les textes insulaires, ils sont souvent les premiers à les rapporter, comme le souligne le chanoine Doble à propos d'Wrmonoc.<sup>46</sup> C'est dire tout l'intérêt d'une étude approfondie de ces sources.



Les rédacteurs écrivent avec une belle assurance. Pourtant ils vivent pour la plupart deux ou trois siècles après le saint célébré et dans une région étrangère aux faits qu'ils rapportent. Données authentiques ou histoire déformée par la légende, peu importe ici. D'où tiennent-ils cette masse d'informations? Tout en faisant la part de leur propre imagination, nous ne pouvons adopter l'attitude hyper-critique qui consiste à dire qu'ils ont inventé de toutes pièces les épisodes relatés, pour nombre desquels nous disposons de recoupements insulaires. Il est donc raisonnable de supposer qu'ils ont eu recours à des informateurs ou à des documents d'outre mer.

Deux de nos auteurs sont explicites à ce sujet. Ainsi le Dolois déclare dès le prologue qu'il a reçu des informations d'un vieux moine grand-breton, qui finissait ses jours au monastère. Ce vieillard était le neveu d'un diacre, Hénoc, cousin de Samson, qui avait interrogé la mère du saint et composé une Vie que le vieux moine avait fait lire devant notre rédacteur.<sup>47</sup>

Plus loin il fait plusieurs fois allusion à des sources orales:

- 1.17: suauem ac laetissimam cum pistore sanctum Samson conlocutionem habuisse audiui;
- 1.37: quin immo omnia, ut aiunt, quae in hac patria per eum Dominus operatus est, unum tamen e pluribus in medium deducamus;
- 1.42: in monasterio quod, ut aiunt, a sancto Germano fuerat constructum;
- 1.45: ut narrare postea suo pa<t>ri audiui.

Il a aussi utilisé des sources écrites:

- 1.38: referentibus autem mihi de eo litteris transmarinis supra iam insignatis in Penetale monasterium quieuisse...certum teneo;
- 1.42: indiculum dirigunt, quod indiculum ego audiui lectum.

Un dernier passage nous renvoie à ces types de sources:

- 2.8: ut mihi comperti ac religiosi et, quid est maius, litterae ipsius loco ultra mare catholice conscriptae tradiderunt.

De la même façon Wrmmonoc a recours à des informateurs et à des écrits d'outre mer:

- 7: Ibique quaedam habitacula et paruum oratorium quod nunc sub nomine suorum, quorum in hoc opusculo nomina iam praefigere curauimus, fratrum, multis decoratum aedificiis dicunt, fabricauit;
- 10: Via autem ubi per ambitum eiusdem littoris peragrarunt inter columnas praedictas media incedens, semita Pauli a transmarinis uocitatur
- 11: Presbiterorum uerum tantum quos in eiusdem Pauli comitatu siue scripto, siue relatu interfuisse didicimus in hoc loco uocabula censimus esse describenda.

Mail il y a mieux. Le Dolois déclare être allé sur place, peut-être en mission d'information, et avoir vu quelques-uns des lieux illustrés par Samson:

1.20: Erat autem non longe ab hoc monasterio insula quaedam nuper fundata a quodam egregio uiro ac sancto presbitero Piro nomine, in qua insula et ego fui;

1.41: locusque in quo tres fratres supradicti fuerant usque ad tempus quando ego fui in Britannia:

1.48: uidit ante eos in cuiusdam uertice montis, simulacrum abominabile adsistere; in quo monte et ego fui, signumque crucis quod sanctus Samson sua manu cum quodam ferro in lapide stante sculpsit adorauit et mea manu palpauit.

De même Bili fait allusion à la fameuse ronce de Nantcarvan que de nombreux voyageurs bretons ont pu voir:

1.25: Quam validissimam multi ex nostris regionibus ad illam patriam euntes uiderunt.

Nos auteurs ont donc pris soin de s'informer - c'est du moins ce qu'ils affirment - en lisant, en écoutant, en allant sur place. Il ne faut donc pas s'étonner si, en plus des renseignements qu'ils nous transmettent sur leur saint, ils montrent ici et là une certaine connaissance du pays où se passe l'action qu'ils rapportent.

Ainsi la figure de Germain d'Auxerre, maître, supposé d'Iltut, est évoquée par le Dolois et par le moine de Lehon:

Samson 1.7: Que et ipse Iltutus de disciplinis erat sancti Germani, et ipse Germanus ordinauerat eum in sua iuuentute presbyterum:

Magloire 1: Qui uterque monachicae normam habentes religionis, a quodam egregii Germani Autissiodorensis Ecclesiae praesulis discipulo nomine Heltuto, tam artium liberalium quam et diuinorum eloquiorum instantissima eruditione fuerunt edocti.

On connaît ses voyages en Grande-Bretagne:

Samson 1.42: in monasterio quod, ut aiunt, a sancto Germano fuerat constructum,

voyages motivés par l'extension dans l'île du Pélagianisme, comme le rappelle le moine de Lehon, qui en profite pour citer un point de la doctrine des hérétiques:

Magloire 1: Qui scilicet praesul Germanus commemoratam superius Britannorum nationem ad terebrandam prauam dogmatis haereticorum fallaciam, quae in ea iam adeo pullulauerat, olim expetiit. Testabantur autem ipsi docentes, liberos ex patribus et matribus baptisatis procreatos, sine baptismi gratia posse saluari, cum Dominus dicat: "Nisi qui renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu sancto, non potest introire in regnum Dei." Quo praerogativa catholicae fidei errore depresso, ad sedem propriam remeauit.

Dans la Vie de Guénolé, c'est le grand apôtre de l'Irlande, Patrice, qui est évoqué. Après un miracle du jeune Guénolé, le maître Budoc et ses élèves entonnent un hymne en vers élégiaques où il est dit:

1.11: Discipulus sancti qui constans more Patricii, Christum pro nobis poscere semper habe.



Comme les condisciples de Guénolé avaient coutume de répéter cet hymne, notre saint fut appelé jusqu'à sa mort *discipulus sancti Patricii*. Plus tard, au cours d'une nuit, il vient à l'esprit de Guénolé l'idée de visiter les lieux où vécut Patrice. C'est l'occasion pour le rédacteur de rappeler ce que représente Patrice pour l'Irlande et la Chrétienté, lui qui a lutté contre les *magi* et les *arioli* de l'île. La même nuit, le grand saint apparaît à notre moine pour l'engager à rester en Bretagne (l.19).

Les rédacteurs comprennent la langue des Grands-Bretons. Il leur arrive de traduire en latin un nom de lieu ou un nom d'homme. Ainsi *Wrmonoc*:

l: *prouincia quae brittanica gentis lingua, eo quod quaedam ipsius pars habetur insula, Penn Ohen latina autem caput dicitur boum;*

l: *in una eademque regione quae lingua eorum Brehant dincat, latina autem guttur receptaculi pugnae dicitur.*

De même l'Anonyme de Dol:

l.46: *sapientissimus illorum..Iuniaum nomine, qui et ipse britannica lingua cum illis lux vocitabatur.*<sup>48</sup>

C'est encore *Wrmonoc* qui signale l'habitude de Grands-Bretons de former des hypocoristiques en *To-*:

ll: *Quonoco, quem alii sub additamento more gentis transmarinae Toquonocum uocant.*<sup>49</sup>

Cette connaissance de vieux-gallois ne nous surprend pas. Les Bretons qui visitaient les îles devaient avoir recours et au latin et à la langue de pays. Bien mieux, au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle le vieux-breton est encore très proche du vieux-gallois, la différenciation commencée trois siècles plus tôt n'était pas assez avancée pour gêner la compréhension réciproque. Nous le savons en particulier par un témoignage daté de la seconde moitié du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle et consigné dans le Livre de Llandâv: *quod ipse Guidnerth (un prince gallois) et Britones et archiepiscopus illius terrae essent unius linguae et unius nationis quamuis diuiderentur spatio.*<sup>50</sup> Témoignage qui concorde avec ce que nous dit vers la même époque le moine de Lehon, à propos du départ de Samson pour la Bretagne: *ad praedicandum populo eiusdem linguae in Occidente consistenti mare transfretauit* (3).

\*

\* \*

Cette dernière constatation nous introduit à mon troisième point. Puisqu'en effet la même langue, ou presque, est parlée de chaque côté de la Manche, nous devons nous attendre à ce que d'autres usages

spécifiques se retrouvent chez les habitants des deux rives de cette mer. De fait les Vies nous fournissent à ce sujet un matériel intéressant.

Plongés dans le milieu des religieux, commençons par les coutumes monastiques.

Une des caractéristiques du monachisme celtique est la récitation des Psaumes dans des conditions particulièrement dures, rappelant l'ascétisme des Pères d'Egypte. Tout d'abord le psautier doit être récité en entier chaque jour, par trois cinquantaines, les fameux *tri cœcat* des Irlandais, cités par l'ordo de Kil-Ros, les règles de Máel-Rúain, de Comgall et d'Ailbe d'Emly. Mais ce n'est pas tout. Cette prière était accompagnée de pratiques mortifiantes: *génuflexions*, bras en crois (*croisfigil*), immersion dans l'eau froide.<sup>51</sup> Or nous savons que cet usage avait cours en Bretagne, au moins à Landévenec: Guénolé 2.9: *Quinquagenos namque ter cotidie particulatim psalmos consuescebat psallere, nunc in crucis modo, nunc immobilis fixus statura, nunc fixis prouolutis genibus.* C'est le texte de Clément. Voici ce qu'écrit *Wrdisten* en 2.14: *in psallendo nunc pedibus fixis, nunc genibus flexis, modo manibus expansis.* L'usage de l'immersion nous est donné par la Vie de Guénaél 5:

*Singulis noctibus, dum pausarent fratres in frigidissimum flumen, quod monasterium praeterfluebat, clam descendens usque ad scapulos, donec septem paenitentiales psalmos pro se cunctisque fidelibus dixisset ibi morabatur.*

Le moine irlandais confesse ses fautes à un autre moine en qui il a toute confiance: c'est l'*anmchara*, l'ami de l'âme.<sup>52</sup> Cet usage est connu en Bretagne par la première Vie de Turiau 15-16.<sup>53</sup> Le saint a pour confesseur Budocan, qu'il considère comme un père plein de science et de sagesse (*quem ut pater habuerat eruditum*) et qu'il va trouver quand il sent que l'heure de sa mort approche.

L'utilisation de cloches est aussi un fait caractéristique des pays celtiques. Je passe sur la cloche de monastère pour m'arrêter sur la cloche personnelle du saint. Nous connaissons celles des Irlandais, dont les pouvoirs sont innombrables: ressusciter les morts, guérir les maladies, chasser les démons, détruire les monstres etc..<sup>54</sup> Paul Aurélien possède une cloche de ce genre. Le roi Marc lui avait refusé le don de cet instrument mais elle traverse la Manche dans le ventre d'un poisson et parvient miraculeusement à Paul:



Haec est autem illa eademque cloca quae per cunctos latinorum populos longi fulua nomine nota uocitatur, cuius per operationem quamuis eiusdem sancti impetrantibus meritis non solum multos langores fugatos sed etiam in quodam eius tactu rediuium quemdam mortuum, eisdem qui uiderant attestantibus, audiuius esse suscitatum.<sup>55</sup>

Il faudrait encore signaler le bâton du saint, qui a les mêmes pouvoirs que la cloche, le réglementation sévère écartant les femmes du monastère, attestée pour le second ordre des saints irlandais<sup>56</sup> et que nous retrouvons en Bretagne avec Bili et le moine de Lehon: un des diacres de Magloire ayant péché avec une courtisane qu'il avait vue à la porte de l'église, le saint décida d'interdire l'accès de l'édifice aux femmes.<sup>57</sup>

Signalons pour finir que les moines d'Egypte sont honorés en Bretagne et suivis par les Bretons comme des modèles. Ainsi *Vie de Guénolé* 1.2, où il est question de Basile et de Paphnuce; 2.12: *Talis autem ars unicuique eorum dabatur, ut ex opere manuum cotidiano, sicut Aegyptii monachi, se posset in victu cotidiano coninteri.* De même

*Vie de Paul* 6: ad illos tantum dicebat heremitas pertinere qui, consortio mundi derelicto, timore Dei arctissima suum afflictione discruciant corpus, exemple illius eximii patris Antonii, qui primus auias solitudinis arctissimam ingressus habitationem Christicolae docuit, ut squalida locorum rura per saltus peterent.

Cela concorde avec ce qu'écrit des religieux celtes Nora Chadwick dans son *Age of the Saints*<sup>58</sup> et ce que nous lisons dans la *Vita David* de Rhygyfarch au c.31: *Sed Egyptios monachos imitatus, similem eis duxit vitam.*

Comme on peut s'y attendre, nous avons moins de renseignements sur les usages civils communs aux habitants des deux Bretagnes. Nous relevons toutefois deux allusions à la mise en nourriture ou *fost-erage*<sup>59</sup> chez Bili en 1.50:

Post mortem Iudeli surrexit quidam impius et haereticus Rethwalus nomine, qui uolebat omnes filios principis antedicti interficere, praeter ipsum Heloch, quem ipse a se nutritum uolebat leuare in regnum. Sed, cum septem ex his occidere iussisset, unus ex ipsis cum nutritio suo ad cellulam sancti Machuti fugiens latebram expetiit,

et dans la *Vie de Guénolé* en 1.18:

Puer autem, a quo regebatur (equus), Maglus, Conomagli filius, Pracani nutritoris, appellabatur.

Sur le plan de la culture intellectuelle, je remarque que les Bretons lisent Gildas, au moins à Landévenec, et qu'ainsi le saint jouissait d'une grande réputation des deux côtés de la Manche. Le

moine Clément s'inspire ouvertement du *De Excidio* dans ce qu'il dit de la Bretagne au chapitre 1, Livre 1 de son ouvrage et il invite le lecteur à lire Gildas s'il veut en savoir plus. Dans le cours de la *Vie*, Wrdisten ajoute quelques emprunts plus modestes, comme ce passage de 2.26: *locus...lucidissimi fontis bucliamine...erupto cum leni murmure decurrentium <aquarum> suauissimum fessis post laborem suadentium soporem amoenissimus*, qui rappelle trop ces lignes de Gildas pour ne pas en être en souvenir: *DEB 3: fontibus lucidis crebris undis niueas veluti glareas pellentibus pernitidisque rivis leni murmure serpentibus ipsorumque in ripis accubantibus suavis soporis pignus praetendentibus.*

Son disciple Wrmonoc est lui aussi un lecteur de Gildas. Il en fait l'éloge au c. 3 de la *Vie de Paul* de paraît même connaître une traduction bretonne du *De Excidio*.<sup>60</sup> Il emprunte au rest quelques passages au texte latin. Ainsi au c. 11 ces mots qui rappellent eux aussi l'extrait précédent: *rauco cum murmure lenis aurae decurrens atque in ripis dormientibus suavis soporis suadibile somnum praetendens.*

Je terminerai par les caractéristiques du latin de nos auteurs. Il est probable, vu la qualité littéraire de la plupart des *Vies* anciennes, qu'elles ont été largement influencées du point de vue linguistique par le renouveau du latin des écoles favorisé par la réforme des études entreprise à la demande de Charlemagne et que dans leur majorité elles appartiennent à la branche continentale de la latinité carolingienne. Toutefois je relève des traits qui me paraissent rappeler certains aspects du latin insulaire. On rencontre par exemple quelques mots hispériques: *dusmus* chez Bili, "le diable" connu en particulier par les gloses d'Echternach,<sup>61</sup> *theticus* chez Wrdisten, autre forme du *tithicus* des *Hisperica Famina* et de Gildas,<sup>62</sup> *malina*, "grande marée," dans la *Vie de Magloire*, comme dans le texte A et dans quelques ouvrages insulaires.<sup>63</sup>

Des celticisms également. *Arduus*, dans la *Vita prima Samsonis* 1.38: *optimam et arduam vitam*, traduit, selon J. Loth, l'irlandais *ard*, le gallois *arot*, "élevé." L'expression se retrouve chez Bili et le maître de Guénolé, Budoc, est surnommé *Arduus*.<sup>64</sup> Plus intéressant sans doute est le terme *di(s)cumbitio*, mot technique qui apparaît plusieurs fois chez Bili et dans la *Vita secunda Samsonis* pour désigner des terres données en toute propriété et que L. Fleuriot rapproche du vieux-breton *dicombit/dicomit*.<sup>65</sup>



D'introduction récente sont les mots grecs purement et simplement transcrits en caractères romains. M. Lapidge a montré que cette mode avait été lancée par Jean Scot et qu'après avoir touché quelques Continentaux elle avait connu une grande vogue dans l'Angleterre du Xe siècle.<sup>66</sup> Je trouve chez Bili *chaleuxomen*, qui est probablement une transcription de *καλέσομεν*.<sup>67</sup> De même le *cleptis* de l'hymne que Clément écrivit en l'honneur de Guénolé peut reproduire le grec *κλέπτis* dans la prononciation de l'époque byzantine.<sup>68</sup> A côté je rencontre des formes moins originales, parce qu'elles sont latinisées, mais assez rares, *didaxisti*, *didaxantem*, toujours chez Bili, et *ptalmum* (pour *optalmum* = *ὀφθαλμῶν*) chez Clément.<sup>69</sup>

Je garde pour la bonne bouche la fameuse hyperbate double E1 E2 S1 S2 et ses variantes, dont j'ai déjà eu l'occasion de dire qu'elles étaient une des caractéristiques saillantes de la prose latine celtique.<sup>70</sup> Aux listes que j'ai publiées dans mon article des *Etudes Celtiques* et qui, j'en conviens volontiers, doivent être allégées de quelques exemples mal venus, j'ajouterai pour l'ordre E1 E2 S1 S2 trois exemples de la *Vie de Paul*:

- 1: *flammeo sancti inspiratus <amore> flatus*
- 2: *duarum duobus...mandatorum annixus alis*
- 3: *arctissima suam afflictione discruciant corpus.*

Certains auteurs paraissent même avoir poussé le raffinement jusqu'à augmenter le nombre des éléments de la construction. Ainsi dans la *Vie de Guénolé* on peut voir un ensemble E1 E2 E3 S1 S2 S3 dans *sacrae huius firma historiae praedicti sancti gestorum radice*,<sup>71</sup> si l'on rapporte *huius* à *sancti*.

Wrmonoc pour sa part s'amuse à combiner deux séries d'hyperbates de la façon suivante: E1 E2 e1 e2 S1 S2 s1 s2 dans *universam ueteris ac nouae cum suis ab eodem ediscens bibliothecam legis expositionibus praeceptore* (2).

M. Winterbottom a fait remarquer que l'ordre E1 E2 S1 S2 apparaissait dans la prose latine dès la *Rhétorique* à *Herennius* et il a relevé à travers la latinité des exemples qu'il ne connaissais pas.<sup>72</sup> C'est un fait. Mais la fréquence des occurrences doit être, à mon avis, prise en compte et j'estime que les auteurs latino-celtiques sont particulièrement friands de cette hyperbate.

Je viens de dire que la plupart des Vies anciennes se situaient dans le fil de la tradition continentale carolingienne. Encore faut-il noter que la disjonction simple, du type *sanctarum scientia litterarum*, est très fréquente dans ces Vies, bien plus que dans les

ouvrages continentaux de la même époque. C'était déjà un tic chez Sidoine et Ennode; on la retrouve ensuite dans les Iles, en particulier chez Adomnán. Mais, si j'ai dit "la plupart des Vies," c'est parce qu'il faut réserver une place spéciale à l'oeuvre d'Wrmonoc. Ce n'est pas un hasard si la double hyperbate est particulièrement fréquente dans la *Vie de Paul*, ou si l'on y trouve une combinaison d'hyperbates doubles comme celle que j'ai citée. Le moine de Landévenec s'entend à construire, surtout dans les premières pages de son ouvrage, des phrases qui obligent le lecteur à un véritable jeu de puzzle. On rencontre encore chez lui, au détour d'une proposition, un groupe de mots aussi réduit que *orationis in Dei confisus cito surrexit oratorio* (4) qui révèle une construction en balancier *orationis in Dei confisus...adiutorio*, construction très déroutante, à l'opposé de la syntaxe linéaire et toute romane que l'on remarque dans la *Vie de Turiau*, par exemple: *Turiae domne, Dominus misit me ad te et, propter tuum amorem et deprecationem, iussit me redire in hoc seculo* (5). Or ce goût pour l'entrelac n'apparaît-il pas déjà chez Gildas ou dans la période qui ouvre l'*Epître* à *Ehfrid* et plus tard dans le poème acrostiche de Dunstan, pour citer un poète anglais du Xe siècle?<sup>73</sup>

On me dira que ce style n'est pas propre aux Iles, qu'il en existe des échantillons sous d'autres cieux. Certes, mais la encore là concentration est telle que j'y verrais volontiers la marque d'une recherche entretenue au cours des siècles dans une zone bien déterminée.

Les Vies nous montrent donc que les Bretons partageaient avec les Insulaires un certain nombre d'usages. Cette communauté s'explique bien par les relations étroites qui liaient les deux rives de la Manche et les populations qui les habitaient. C'est dans la *Vie de Guénolé* 1.19 que nous voyons des marchands attendre dans un port breton le vent favorable qui les poussera vers les Iles: *cum mercatoribus transmarina negotia ansportantibus ventum in portu serenum expectantibus simul pergeret et transmigraret ad Scotos*. Dans la *Vie de Turiau* au c. 9 nous lisons que le saint a un ami outre mer, du nom de Gerent (*amicus eius, Geren nomine, quem habebat trans mare*). Cet ami meurt. Turiau en est averti par une vision. Il envoie un bateau et des gens pour s'en informer et ceux-ci rencontrent à mi-route des messagers qui venaient apporter la nouvelle. Les nombreuses occurrences de *citra mare*, *trans mare*, *ultra mare* précisent encore l'existence de ces relations.



\*

\* \*

Il n'est pas sans intérêt de découvrir dans des documents qui s'étendent *grosso modo* des années 850 aux années 1000 combien les Iles et leur civilisation, quatre ou cinq siècles après l'emigration, étaient présentes dans la vie des Bretons continentaux.

Négligée en France, pour ne pas dire méprisée, la Bretagne a été, sauf exceptions, sous-estimée de l'autre côté du Channel.<sup>74</sup> Dans les études celtiques, la part des Bretons a souvent été celle du parent pauvre. Il n'y a guère encore, les plus grands celtisants, et les Français comme les autres, ne leur consacraient qu'une partie de leurs travaux.

Et pourtant, pendant tout le Moyen Âge, avant que les nationalismes naissants ne le transforment en un fossé ou un champ clos, la mer était une route, un trait d'union entre des peuples qui se reconnaissaient comme frères et qui se savaient appartenir à une même communauté d'origine.

Sur la civilisation celtique nous avons donc à apprendre aussi Bretons continentaux. On a remarqué qu'ils étaient parfois les premiers à rapporter une tradition bien connue dans les Iles, je l'ai signalé plus haut à propos de la *Vie de Paul*. N'en est-il pas de même avec la mère de Guénolé, Alba Trímamma, Gwen Teirbron, dont nous parle le moine Clément?<sup>75</sup> Rendre aux Bretons la part qui leur revient dans le concert des peuples celtiques, tel est aujourd'hui l'effort de savants comme L. Fleuriot.

On aura remarqué que dans ces Vies la Grande-Bretagne tient en volume une place plus importante que l'Irlande. La géographie et l'histoire l'imposaient. C'est peut-être cette intimité que explique que le monastère fondé par Guénaél en Grande-Bretagne est, selon son biographe, plus remarquable que celui qu'il a construit dans l'île voisine. Mais d'un autre côté ce sont des *Scotti peritissimi* que Samson suit en Irlande, et non d'autres Bretons. N'oublions pas non plus l'attrait qu'a exercé sur Guénolé, ou sur Wrdisten, la personnalité de Patrice.

L'attachement à la culture des pays celtiques est donc encore très fort chez les moines de la Bretagne carolingienne. Pourtant depuis le début du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle les souverains francs s'efforcent de faire pénétrer leur influence dans la péninsule. En 818 Louis le

Pieux, au cours d'une expédition en Bretagne, impose à Landévenec la règle bénédictine. Quand Redon est fondé en 832, le roi s'intéresse à ses débuts et la même règle y est introduite par un bénédictin de Glanfeuil. Sans aucun doute la réforme carolingienne a touché les écoles bretonnes: un texte comme la *Vie de Magloire* le montre. Il serait intéressant de savoir ce que donnera la suite et de voir jouer dans les écrits postérieurs les influences celtique et continentale.



## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>L'ouvrage de référence sur les Vies bretonnes est le "Memento des sources hagiographiques de l'histoire de Bretagne" de F. Duine, *Bulletin et Mémoires de la Société d'archéologie du département d'Ile-et-Vilaine* 46 (1918): 243-457. J'ai retenu dans ma collection, à partir des chapitre 1 et 2 du *Memento*, quatorze textes, en fonction de lieu d'activité du saint et de la datation de la Vie proposée par Duine: Conwoyon (Duine n°5), Guénaél (n°6), Guénolé (n°7), Magloire (n°10), Malo (Vie anonyme et Vie par Bili: n°11), Melain (n°13), Paul Aurélien (n°14), Samson (*Vita prima* et *Vita secunda*: n°2), Tudual (*Vita prima*: n°15), Turiau (*Vita prima* et *Vita secunda*: n°16), *Gesta sanctorum Rotonensium* (n°5). Sont aussi écartées les Vies postérieures contenant des éléments plus anciens, comme par exemple les Vies de Briec et de Gildas.

<sup>2</sup>*Saint Paulinus of Wales*, Guildford and Esher, 1942. Repris dans le recueil *Lives of the Welsh Saints*, édité par D. Simon (Evans, Cardiff, 1971), pp. 146-61.

<sup>3</sup>"Les hagiographes bretons et la Renaissance carolingienne," *Bulletin philologique et historique* (1966), pp. 651-59.

<sup>4</sup>Le chapitre 7, "Brittany," pp. 160-190 de la 2ème éd., Cardiff, 1977.

<sup>5</sup>*Annales de Bretagne et des Pays de l'Ouest* 81 (1974): 25-42.

<sup>6</sup>*Francia* 5 (1977): 1-26.

<sup>7</sup>Je précise qu'ici la valeur historique des Vies ne me concerne pas. Ce qui compte, c'est ce que rapportent les auteurs, qu'il s'agisse de faits réels, de légendes ou de faux.

<sup>8</sup>Ed. C. De Smedt, *AB* 7 (1888): 172-249. Sur la composition de la Vie, voir R. Latouche, *Mélanges d'histoire de Cornouaille (Ve-XIe siècle)* (Paris, 1911), pp. 9-24.

<sup>9</sup>Ed. C. Cuissard, *RC* 5 (1883): 417-58.

<sup>10</sup>Ed. F. Lot, *Annales de Bretagne* 24 (1908-1909): 244-62, 382-405, 575-98; 25 (1909-1910): 47-73.

<sup>11</sup>La Vie proprement dite est éditée par les Bollandistes *Acta Sanctorum*, oct., X p. 782-91 et les *Miracles*, par A. de La Borderie (*Miracles de S. Magloire et fondation du monastère de Lehon*, [Rennes, 1891]).

<sup>12</sup>Ed. A. de la Borderie, *Mémoires de la Société d'Archéologie des Côtes-du-Nord*, 2ème série, 2:84 ff.

<sup>13</sup>Ed. R. Fawtier, *La Vie de Saint Samson. Essai de critique hagiographique* (Paris, 1912). Pour la datation, voir Poulin, pp. 4-5.

<sup>14</sup>Ed. F. Plaine, *AB* 6 (1887): 79-80 et 82-150.

<sup>15</sup>Ed. Bollandistes, *Ad Sanctorum*, nov., I, p. 674-679.

<sup>16</sup>Ed. F. Lot, *Annales de Bretagne* 23 (1907-1908): 560-79; 24 (1908-1909): 90-106.

<sup>17</sup>*Vita prima* 1.1; *Vita secunda* 1.1. La *Vita secunda* précise qu'Anna est originaire de Venoetia patria (Gwent, selon l'éditeur).

<sup>18</sup>Vie 1.

<sup>19</sup>Vie anonyme 1 et 14; Vie par Bili 1.1.

<sup>20</sup>Vie 1.

<sup>21</sup>Doble, pp. 146-56.

<sup>22</sup>Vie 1.

<sup>23</sup>*Vita secunda* (éd. La Borderie, cf. n. 12) 1.

<sup>24</sup>Vie 1.2.

<sup>25</sup>Vie de Paul 2 et 3; *Vita prima Samsonis* 1.7; *Vita secunda Samsonis* 1.4; Vie de Magloire 1.

<sup>26</sup>Vie anonyme 1; Vie par Bili 1.2 et 3.

<sup>27</sup>Vie anonyme 1; Vie par Bili 1.1.

<sup>28</sup>Vie 2.

<sup>29</sup>*Vita prima* 1.20; *Vita secunda* 1.8.

<sup>30</sup>Doble, p. 99.

<sup>31</sup>*Vita prima* 1.22-32; *Vita secunda* 1.9.

<sup>32</sup>*Vita prima* 1.33-36; *Vita secunda* 1.10.

<sup>33</sup>*Vita prima* 1.37-39; *Vita secunda* 1.11-12.

<sup>34</sup>*Vita prima* 1.39-41; *Vita secunda* 1.13.

<sup>35</sup>*Vita prima* 42-44; *Vita secunda* 1.13-14.

<sup>36</sup>*Vita prima* 1.45-52; *Vita secunda* 1.15-17 et 2.1.

<sup>37</sup>Vie 3.



- <sup>38</sup>Vie 7; Double, pp. 150-52.
- <sup>39</sup>Vie 8; Double, pp. 156-57.
- <sup>40</sup>Vie 9-10; Double, pp. 158-61.
- <sup>41</sup>Vie anonyme 7.
- <sup>42</sup>Vie anonyme 9-14; Vie par Bili 1.15-24.
- <sup>43</sup>Vie anonyme 14-15; Vie par Bili 1.26-28.
- <sup>44</sup>Vie 1.19.
- <sup>45</sup>Vie 2. 9-11.
- <sup>46</sup>Double, p. 147.
- <sup>47</sup>Vita prima, 1er prologue, 2.
- <sup>48</sup>Les MSS E F H X donnent une leçon *Uiniaus* - m qui correspond mieux à la traduction lux, si *Uiniaus* est à rapprocher de *Uinniau(s)* que L. Fleuriot, dans son *Dictionnaire des gloses en vieux breton* (Paris, 1964), s.v., interprète comme dérivé de *uinn(n)*, "blanc, heureux" (voir aussi sous *guinn*, "blanc, lumineux").
- <sup>49</sup>Le vieux-breton a également cette formation: L. Fleuriot, *Le vieux breton, Eléments d'une grammaire*, (Paris, 1964), pp. 403-5.
- <sup>50</sup>Fleuriot, *Dictionnaire*, p. 13.
- <sup>51</sup>L. Gougaud, *Les chrétientés celtiques* (Paris, 1911), pp. 97-100 et 310; O. Loyer, *Les chrétientés celtiques*, (Paris, 1965), pp. 40-41.
- <sup>52</sup>Gougaud, p. 278. On a en latin *amicus animae* dans la *Vita Naedoc 20 (V)*, la *Vita Moluae 38 (S1)* et la *Vita Barri 14*, en face de *pater confessionis*, *V. Naedoc 20(M)*, *Vita Moluae 38*, *Vita Barri 14* et *confessor*, *Vita Naedoc 20 (S R 1)*, *Vita Barri 14*.
- <sup>53</sup>Ed. F. Duine, *Bulletin et Mémoires de la Société archéologique du département d'Ile-et-Vilaine* 41.2 (1912): 29-47.
- <sup>54</sup>C. Plummer, *Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae* (Oxford, 1910) 1: clxxvi, ff.
- <sup>55</sup>Vie 9 et 17.
- <sup>56</sup>C. Plummer, p. cxxi et n. 4.
- <sup>57</sup>Vie par Bili 1.31: *non solum a conspectu mulierum uolens se separare*; *Miracles de Magloire* 4. (10).
- <sup>58</sup>P. 35, ff.
- <sup>59</sup>Sur le fosterage dans les Vies, voir mon "Essai sur la mise en nourriture et l'éducation dans les pays celtiques d'après le

témoignage des textes hagiographiques latins," *EC* 12, (1968-9): 101-46 (pour les deux passages concernés, pp. 126-7).

<sup>60</sup>Vie 3: *sanctum Gyldan cuius sagacitatem ingenii... liber ille... quem Ormestam Britannicae vocant declarat*. Voir la note de H. Gaidex, *RC* 5: 459-60 et L. Fleuriot, *Dictionnaire*, s.v. *ormest*. *Ormesta Britanniae* peut être le titre breton latinisé du *De Excidio* ou celui de sa version bretonne.

<sup>61</sup>Vie par Bili 1.23; H. F., C 47 *dusmus: diabolus; Adelphus Adelpha* 33.

<sup>62</sup>Vie de Guénolé 2.4; H. F. A107, 390, 481, 563; B144, D114; *DEB* 19.

<sup>63</sup>Vie de Magloire 21. H. F. A400. Sur ce mot, voir M. Herren, *The Hisperica Famina* 1 (Toronto, 1974): 180.

<sup>64</sup>Vie par Bili 1.66; Vie de Guénolé 1.4. Voir J. Loth, *RC* 39 (1922): 310, n. 2.

<sup>65</sup>Vie par Bili 1.43, 44 etc.; *Vita secunda Samsonis* 2.18.19, etc. Voir L. Fleuriot, *Dictionnaire*, s.v. *dicomit*.

<sup>66</sup>M. Lapidge, "L'influence stylistique de la poésie de Jean Scot," dans *Jean Scot Erigène et l'histoire de la philosophie*, (Colloque de Laon, 1975 [Paris, 1977]), pp. 441-52.

<sup>67</sup>Vie par Bili *Ymnus sancti Machuti* 23. Cf. *Adelphus adelpha* 7: *calexomen* (glosé *rogemus*); dans S: *caleuxomen* (glosé *uocamus*).

<sup>68</sup>*Hymnus* (éd. De Smedt, loc. cit., p. 263-4), v. 75.

<sup>69</sup>Vie par Bili 1.26 et 30; *Hymnus*, v.71.

<sup>70</sup>"Une mode stylistique dans la prose latine des pays celtiques," *EC* 13 (1972): 275-97.

<sup>71</sup>Dans la notice rédigé par *Wrdisten* avant 1.1.

<sup>72</sup>"A Celtic Hyperbaton?", *BBCS* 27 (1977): 207-12.

<sup>73</sup>Donné par M. Lapidge dans "The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature," *ASE* 4 (1975): 108-111.

<sup>74</sup>Voir Fleuriot, *Dictionnaire*, p. 33, n. 1: "L'importance de la Bretagne continentale dans le monde celtique du haut Moyen-Age paraît parfois sous-estimée."

<sup>75</sup>Vie de Guénolé 1.2.



# MANUSCRIPT INDEX

- Albi. Bibliothèque Rochegude, MS 29: 110 n60
- Alençon. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 14 (Codex Alentionensis): 132 nn79, 80
- Amiens. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 426: 15
- Antwerp. Plantin-Moretus Museum, MS 47: 81 n141
- Bamberg. Bibliothek, MS B.II.10: 53, 54
- Berlin. Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Philipps 121 (Codex Berlinensis): 132 n79
- Bern. Burgerbibliothek, MS 337: 77 n107  
MS 363: 43 n39
- Boulogne-sur-Mer. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 74(82): 51, 71 n54
- Brussels. Bibliothèque Royale, MS 1828-30: 81 n141
- Cambridge. Corpus Christi College, MS 9: 70 n48, 160  
MS 173: 168, 169, 177 n70  
MS 183: 132 nn73, 75, 176 n61  
MS 285: 132 n71  
MS 326: 132 n72  
MS 356, pt. 3: 81 n141
- Pembroke College, MS 120: 174 n30
- Trinity College, MS R.15.32: 79 n127
- University Library, MS Ee. 2.4: 160  
MS Gg. 5.35: 57, 58, 160  
MS Ii. 3.12: 173 n16
- Cologne. Dombibliothek, MS 83<sup>II</sup>: 108 n41
- Einsiedeln. Stiftsbibliothek, MS 318: 193 n69
- Escorial, El. Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo, MS B.iv.17: 74 n78
- Exeter. Cathedral Library, MS 3507: 99, 100, 101, 110 nn57, 58
- Hereford. Cathedral Library, MS P. i. 17: 132 n72
- Laon. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 298: 44 n55  
MS 468: 27, 31, 32, 37, 38
- Leiden. Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS Scaligeranus 69: 58
- Lincoln. Cathedral Library, MS 182: 174 n34
- London. British Library, Additional MS 32246: 81 n141  
MS 38132: 82 n153  
MS 47967: 168, 177 n70  
MS Cotton Augustus ii.18: 50  
MS Cotton Caligula A.xv: 106 n21  
MS Cotton Domitian i: 101, 110 n57  
MS Cotton Galba A.xviii: 48  
MS Cotton Julius A.vi: 122  
MS Cotton Nero A.i: 172 n10  
MS Cotton Nero E.i, vol. 1: 61, 70 n48  
MS Cotton Nero E.i, vol. 2: 70 n48  
MS Cotton Otho B.xi: 168  
MS Cotton Tiberius A.vi: 175 n44  
MS Cotton Tiberius A.xv: 58  
MS Cotton Tiberius C.ii: 80 n136  
MS Cotton Tiberius D.iv, vol. 2: 78 n120  
MS Cotton Vespasian D.xii: 122  
MS Cotton Vitellius A.xii: 104 n5, 110 nn57, 58  
MS Cotton Vitellius A.xiii: 99, 100  
MS Cotton Vitellius A.xix: 132 nn73, 74, 75  
MS Harley 1117: 132 nn73, 75  
MS Harley 2506: 80 n139  
MS Harley 3013: 132 n72  
MS Harley 3826: 81 n141  
MS Royal 2A.xx: 48  
MS Royal 5E.xi: 132 n72  
MS Royal 6A.vi: 132 n72



- MS Royal 6B.vii: 132 n72  
 MS Roayl 7D.ii: 81 n141  
 MS Royal 7D.xxiv: 132 n72  
 MS Royal 12D.xvii: 168-169  
 MS Royal 15A.xvi: 81 n141  
 Lambeth Palace, MS 362: 174 n30  
 Lucca. Biblioteca Capitolare, MS 124: 105 n15  
 Milan. Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, MS H 150 inf.: 107 n29, 108 nn37, 41  
 MS L 22 sup.: 15  
 MS M 79 sup.: 47  
 Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 396: 96, 109 n45  
 Clm 4605: 132 n79  
 Clm 6407: 179, 181, 183, 186  
 Clm 18956: 132 n79  
 Clm 18961: 179, 181, 182, 183, 186  
 Orléans. Bibliothèque de la Ville, MS 184(161): 58  
 Oxford. Bodleian Library, MS Auct. F.2.20: 110 n57  
 MS Auct. F.3.14: 110 n57  
 MS Barlow 35: 81 n141  
 MS Bodley 49(1946): 132 n72  
 MS Bodley 97(1928): 132 n72  
 MS Bodley 109(1962): 132 nn73, 75  
 MS Bodley 557(27645): 132 n71  
 MS Digby 63: 75 n90, 106 n21, 109 n48, 168  
 MS Digby 112: 63, 81 nn147, 148, 149  
 MS Digby 146(19747): 132 n72  
 MS Digby 163: 81 n141  
 MS Digby 175(1776): 132 nn73, 75  
 Ms Fell 1: 70 n48  
 Ms Fell 3: 70 n48  
 MS Fell 4: 70 n48  
 MS Hatton 20: 177 n70  
 MS Junius 27: 169  
 MS Rawlinson C 697: 132 n71  
 MSS Top. gen. c.1-4: 82 n153  
 St. John's College, MS 17: 60, 61, 79 n127  
 MS 178: 110 n57  
 Paris. Bibliothèque de la Mazarine, MS 561: 29  
 Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Lat. 1711: 105 n15  
 MS Lat. 2779: 193 n69  
 MS Lat. 3088: 30, 31  
 MS Lat. 5095: 43 n42  
 MS Lat. 5294: 132 n79  
 MS Lat. 7299: 79 n127, 80 n139  
 MS Lat. 10865 (Codex Parisiensis): 132 n79  
 MS Lat. 12949: 29  
 MS Lat. 13953: 179, 180, 181, 182-183, 186  
 MS Lat. 16340: 193 n69  
 Reims. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 118: 30  
 Rouen. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 1.49 (Cat. 524): 108 n41  
 St. Gall. Stiftsbibliothek, MS 248: 108 n41  
 MS 565 (Codex Sangallensis): 132 nn79, 80  
 MS 846: 193 n69  
 St. Paul-in-Karnten. Stiftsbibliothek, MS 25.2.16: 96  
 Salisbury. Cathedral Library, MS 38: 132 n72  
 Schaffhausen. Stadtbibliothek, MS Generalia I: 5  
 Stuttgart. Landbibliothek, MS HB VII 48: 192 n51  
 MS HB XIV 1: 132 nn79, 80  
 Tours. Bibliothèque municipale, MS 334: 107 n29  
 Trier. Stadtbibliothek, MS 1834 (Codex Treverensis): 132 n79  
 Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. lat. 201: 193 n69  
 MS Reg. lat. 1260: 57, 77 n107  
 MS Reg. lat. 1671: 159  
 MS Reg. lat. 1709: 179, 181  
 MS Vat. lat. 3363: 159  
 MS Vat. lat. 6018: 110 n60  
 MS Vat. lat. 7207: 190 n23, 192 n50  
 Vienna. Nationalbibliothek, MS 751: 49  
 Weingarten. MS 1630: 132 n79  
 Würzburg. Universitätsbibliothek, MS M.p.th. f. 34 (Codex Wirzburgensis): 132 nn79, 80  
 MS M.p.th.f. 56: 179, 181  
 MS M.p.th.f. 61: 108 n31

## GENERAL INDEX

Anonymous works are listed by title.

- Aachen, 137, 144  
 Aaron, monk, 199  
 Abbo, St., Abbot of Fleury, 57, 58, 59-60, 61, 62, 80 n139, 83, 99, 103 n2, 106 n22; *Pas-sio S. Eadmundi*, 59, 79 n125; *Quaestiones Grammaticales*, 60  
 Abingdon, 162, 164, 175 n44  
*Acta Synodi Caesareae*, 88-90, 92  
 Adamnan, St., 7, 103 n2, 207; *De Locis Sanctis*, 2, 6; *Vita Columbae*, 3, 5, 9  
 Adelfius *de civitate Colonia Londinensium* (Caelon on Usk?), 87  
 Adomnan. See Adamnan, St.  
 Adriaen, Marcus, 2  
 Aelfric, 59, 78 n118, 79 n125; *Lives of Saints*, 79 n125, 126  
 Aethelgar, 77 n109  
 Aethelred, King, 163  
 Aethelstan, King, 163, 167  
 Aethelwold of Winchester, St., 78 n120, 159, 164; *Benedictional*, 59; *Regularis Concordia*, 59, 78 n118  
*Aethica insula or Tir etha*, 14  
 Aethicus Ister, 6, 14, 58; *Cosmographia*, 57-58, 166  
 Aethilwulf, *De Abbatibus*, 54  
 Afrella, 197, 198  
 Agustinus. See Augustine, St., Bp. of Hippo  
 Aidan, 103 n2  
 Ailbe d'Emly, 203  
 Alba Trimanna, 197, 208  
 Albertus Magnus, 195  
 Alcuin, 6, 25, 39, 46, 53-54, 65, 73 n76, 75 n89, 114, 116, 120, 121, 122, 123, 126, 127 n4, 135-148, 152 nn37, 47, 179, 180, 181, 184, 185, 186, 187, 189 n21, 190 n23; *De Dialectica*, 39; *De Grammatica*, 141-143, 145; *De Trinitate*, 186; "Debate between Winter and Spring," 136; *Dialogus de Rhetorica et Virtutibus*, 39, 135, 140; "Elegy for a Nightingale," 136; *Epistola de Litteris Colendis*, 24; "Epitaph," 136; "Farewell to His Cell," 136, 148, 152 n47; *Libri Carolini*, 73 n76; poem on Lindisfarne, 136; poem on York, 53, 54, 75 n87, 136, 159; *Vita Sancti Iudoci*, 53; *Vita Sancti Willibrodi*, 113, 117, 118, 123, 127 n4, 136  
 Adelmus, 43 n42  
 Aldfrith of Northumbria, 167  
 Aldhelm, St., 7-8, 12, 46, 47, 48-50, 51, 52, 53, 62, 69 n30, 70 n42, 96-98, 100, 109 n48, 110 n58, 114, 117, 119, 120, 122, 123, 125; *Carmen de Virginitate*, 118, 119, 121, 123, 129 n27; *Ciculus Adelmi de Cursu Lunae per Signa xii Seasonum Graecos*, 49, 98, 99; *De Metris*, 72 n61; *De Pedum Regularis*, 69 n30, 72 n61; *De Virginitate*, 50, 113, 115-116, 119, 122; *Enigmata*, 70 n42; *Epistola II*, 68 n24; *Epistola ad Aircium*, 72; *Letter to Geraint*, 109 n48; *Prosa de Virginitate*, 118, 119, 120-121, 123  
 Aldsig, Abbot of York, 75 n90  
 Alexander, Jonathan, 153  
 Alexandria, 84, 86, 89  
 Alfred, King of Wessex, 54, 55, 167, 168, 170  
 Almann of Hautvillers, 28  
 Amalarius of Metz, *Liber Officialis*, 78 n118  
 Ambrose, St., 86, 109 n51a, 180, 181, 183, 184; *De Fide*, 181; *Hexameron*, 189 n21



- Amon, 197  
 Anacletus, Pope, 190 n24  
 Anatolius, St., Bp. of Laodiceae, 88, 95, 97  
 Anderson, Alan Orr, 3  
 Anderson, Marjorie Ogilvy, 3  
 Angilbert, 147  
*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 169  
 Anna, 197  
*Annales Cambriae*, 15  
*Anonymus ad Cummianum*, 14, 38  
 Arator, 51, 53, 62, 119  
 Aratus, 101  
 Aristotle, 34, 36  
 Arles, Synod of (AD 314), 86-87, 88, 111 n61  
 Arminius Diaconus, 87  
 Asper, 103 n2  
 Asser, 45, 159, 170  
 Athelstan Psalter, 48  
 Atlantis, 34  
*Aucassin et Nicolette*, 113  
*Augustalis, Laterculus*, 95  
 Augustine, St., Abp. of Canterbury, 47  
 Augustine, St., Bp. of Hippo, 86, 89, 92, 109 n51a, 119, 179, 181-186, 187; *Confessiones*, 122; *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*, 105 n15; *De Diversis Questionibus*, 181; *De Doctrina Christiana*, 125; *De Genesi ad Litteram*, 92; *De Trinitate*, 181; *Epistola ad Januarium*, 92  
*Auricept na n'Eces*, 13  
 Auxerre, 86, 99  
 Avitus, St., 119  
 "B.", 77 n111; *Vita S. Dunstani*, 58  
 Baker, Peter, 60, 61  
 Bald's *Leechbook*, 169  
 Balthere, 54  
 Bangor, 11, 88, 92  
 Barbet, J., 2  
 Barlow, Frank, 170  
 Basil, St., the Great, 204  
 Bath Abbey, 51  
 Battle, 174 n27  
 Beccán, 85  
 Bede Venerabilis, 6, 9, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 62, 66 n1, 72 n66, 75 n90, 83, 88, 90, 96, 99, 100, 103 n2, 110 n58, 114, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 126; *De Die Iudicii*, 62, 80 n137; *De Natura Rerum*, 60; *De Temporibus*, 60; *De Temporibus Ratione*, 47, 60, 90, 106 n22; *Hexameron*, 9; *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 62, 80 n136, 97, 167; *Vita Sancti Cuthberti*, 113, 114, 116, 118, 122, 123; *Vita Sancti Felicis*, 113, 116  
 Benedict, St., 165; *Regula*, 160, 165, 176 n50  
 Benedict of Aniane, St., *Forma Fidei*, 179; *Monumenta Fidei*, 190 n24  
*Beowulf*, 49  
 Bethurum, Dorothy, 172 n10  
 Biddle, M., 59  
 Bieler, Ludwig, 2, 4, 15, 16  
 Bili, 196, 197, 201, 204, 205, 206  
 Binchy, Daniel A., 7  
 Birr, Co. Offaly, 85  
 Bischoff, Bernhard, 8-9, 10, 14, 15, 39, 47, 68 n24  
 Bishop, Edmund, 47  
 Bishop, T.A.M., 58, 62, 153, 160, 161, 162-164, 170  
 Boethius, 103 n3, 109 n51a, 159, 179; *Arithmetica*, 109 n51a; *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, 62, 80 n138, 113, 176 n56  
 Boissier, Gaston, 120  
 Bolton, W.F., 46, 68 n20, 135  
 Boniface, Bp. of Rome (AD 607), 91  
 Boniface, St., 14, 46, 50, 51, 52, 72 n59; *Ars Grammatica*, 51, 72 n59; *Enigmata*, 51  
 Book of Armagh, 167  
 Bowen, Emrys George, 195  
 Brearley, Denis, 2  
 Breedon-on-the-Hill, Leicestershire, 71 n58  
 Brehant, 197  
 Brendan, St., 198, 199; *Navigatio*, 3, 15  
 Brittany, 7, 169, 170, 179, 198, 199, 203, 204, 208, 209  
 Brooks, Nicholas, 55, 58, 168  
 Brown, Alan K., 5  
 Brown, Julian, 155, 156, 173 n17  
 Brunhölzl, Franz, 14  
 Budoc Arduus, 201, 205  
 Budocan, 203  
 Buildwas, 174 n27  
 Bullough, Donald, 53, 56, 74 n78  
 Burginda, 51  
 Bury Saint Edmunds (Suffolk), 162, 174 n20  
 Byrhtferth of Ramsey, 60-62, 64,

- 80 n138, 157; *Enchiridion*, 60, 61, 80 n139; *Historia Regum*, 61, 80 n136, 137, see also Symeon of Durham; *Vita S. Ecgwini*, 61, 80 n137; *Vita S. Oswaldi*, 61, 80 n139  
 Caecilian, Bp. of Carthage, 86  
 Caer Bannhed, 199  
 Caesar, Gaius, 90  
 Caesarea, 89  
 Caldeus, Caldeans, 34  
 Caldy, Île de, 198  
 "Cambridge Songs," 160  
 Campbell, Alistair, 46, 67 n18, 169  
 Campus Albus, Synod of (AD 631), 84  
 Campus Lenis, Ireland. See Magh Léna  
 Candidus, 181, 183, 184, 185; see also Candidus-Wizo  
 Candidus-Brun of Fulda, 180, 186  
 Candidus-Wizo, 180, 185, 186-187, 188 n1, 192 n55, 193 n67; *Num Christus Corporeis Oculis Deum Videre Potuerit*, 186, 187; *Opusculum de Passione Domini*, 186, 187  
*Canones Hibernenses*, 15  
 Canterbury, 47, 48, 49, 58, 91, 98, 166; see also Christ Church, Canterbury; St. Augustine's, Canterbury  
*Carmen ad Flavium Felicem de Resurrectione Mortuorum*, 51  
 Carthage, 89  
 Carvanna, 197  
 Cassiodorus, 103 n3, 109 n51a; *De Anima*, 192 n57  
 Castel Dore. See Caer Bannhed  
 Catouius, King, 197  
 Cellanus, Abbot of Perrona Scottorum, 12  
 Ceolwulf, 167  
 Chadwick, Nora, 204  
 Chalcidius, 179  
 Chaplais, Pierre, 47, 50  
 Charlemagne, 54, 135, 144, 145, 205  
 Charles the Bald, 31  
 Chase, Colin, 65, 154  
 Chester-le-Street, 167  
 Christ Church, Canterbury, 58, 62, 162, 173  
 Chrysostom, John, St., 47  
 Cicero, 35  
 Ciggaar, Krijnie, 63  
 Claudian, 69 n30  
 Claudianus Mamertus, 182, 183, 185, 186, 187, 192 n57, 193 n69; *De Statu Animae*, 187, 193 n69  
 Clément, monk, 196, 203, 205, 206  
 Clement of Alexandria, 47  
 Clonfert, 104 n6  
 Clonfert-Mulloe, Co. Laois, 85  
 Clonmacnois, Co. Offaly, 85  
 Coccia, Edmondo, 9-10, 12-13, 16  
 Colgrave, Bertram, 46, 66 n1, 114, 117  
 Columba the Younger. See Columbanus, St.  
 Columbanus, Abbot of St. Trond, 12; *Planctus*, 12  
 Columbanus, St., 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 88, 92, 93; *Ad Fidolium*, 12; *Ad Hunaldum*, 12; *Ad Sethum*, 12; *Opera*, 2  
 Comgall, St., 203  
 Compiègne, 29  
*Computus Carthaginensis*, 88, 89  
*Coniugationes Verborum*, 51  
 Constantine, Emperor, 86  
 Constantinople, 63  
 Contreni, John, 10, 57  
 Corbie, 57  
 Corippus, 50  
 Cornouailles, 198, 199  
 Crediton, 98  
 Cripplegate Hospital, London, 174 n27  
 Cummianus, 14, 38  
 Cummaine Fota (Cumianus or Comianus or Cumineus Longus), Abbot of Clonfert, 104 n6; *Celebra Iuda*, 104 n6  
 Cummian, 84-96, 99, 101, 102, 105 n15, 107 n28, 111 n61; *Epistola*, 85  
 Curtius, Ernst Robert, 114, 117  
 Cyprian, *Traotatus de Ratione Paschas*, 90  
 Cyril, Bp. of Alexandria (AD 436-444), 91; *Epistola de Pascha (Epistola Cyrilli)*, 91, 94  
 Damasus, 119  
*De Decem Categoriis Augustini*, 180, 181, 182  
*De Dignitate Conditionis Humanae*, 180  
*De Libero Arbitrio*, 80 n138



*De Loco*, 180, 182  
*De Loco Dei*, 182, 187  
*De Mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae*, 14, 15, 108 n36; see also Pseudo-Augustine  
*De Substantia*, 182  
*De Tempore*, 180, 182, 187  
*Declinationes Nominum*, 51  
*Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae*, 190 n24  
Deruuela, 197  
Deshman, Robert, 59, 166  
Dewi, 198  
Díaz y Díaz, Manual C., 3, 27, 38, 39  
*Dicta Albini*, 181, 182, 184, 185, 189 n21, 190 nn23, 24  
*Dicta Albini Diaconi de Imagine Dei*, 180, 181, 182, 183  
*Dicta Candidi*, 179-180, 181, 182, 184, 185, 186; see also Candidus-Wizo  
*Dicta Candidi de Imagine Dei*, 179, 180, 182, 183, 186  
*Dicta Candidi Presbyteri de Imagine Dei*, 180  
*Dictionary of Medieval Latin from Celtic Sources*, 15  
Dicuilus, *Liber de Mensura Orbis Terrae*, 2  
Dionysius, 108 n41; see also Dionysius Exiguus  
Dionysius Exiguus, 90, 91, 94, 95, 103 n2, 108 nn31, 39; *Argumenta Paschalia*, 90, 107 n24; *Canones Ecclesiastici* 38, 91; *Epistola ad Bonifatium et Bonum*, 94, 106 n21; *Epistola ad Petronium*, 94, 106 n21; *Tabula Paschalis*, 90, 94, 107 n24  
*Disputatio Marini Episcopi Alexandrini de Ratione Paschali*, 91  
*Disticha Catonis*, 62  
Doble, Gilbert H., 197, 199  
Docco, 198  
Dol, monk of, 196, 198, 200, 201, 202  
Domnonée, 197  
Donatus, Aelius, 15, 21 n87, 38, 137; *Ars Maior*, 2, 96; *Ars Minor*, 2  
Dorhene, 5  
Draak, Maartje, 14  
Dracontius, 53, 119  
Dubricius, Bp., 198  
Duckett, Eleanor Shipley, 46

Duine, François, 195, 197  
Dümmler, Ernst, 46, 53, 73 n73, 123, 124, 180  
Dumville, David, 61, 76 n99  
Dunstan, St., Abp. of Canterbury, 58, 59, 77 n109, 157, 159, 173 n17, 207; see also *Vita S. Dunstani*  
Dunrow, 104 n6  
Eborius of York, 87  
Echa, 54  
Edelstein, Wolfgang, 135  
Edmund of East Anglia, St., 61, 79 n125  
Egbert, Abp. of York, *Penitential*, 99  
Egbert, St., 103 n2  
Egypt, Egyptians, 34, 204  
Ehwald, Rudolf, 46, 48, 49, 122, 123  
Einhard, 180  
Elias, Bp. of Angoulême (861-875), 28  
Elipandus, Abp. of Toledo, 144  
Emly, Co. Tipperary, 85  
Epiphanius, St., 47, 48  
*Epistola Philippi de Pascha*, 89; see also *Acta Synodi Caesareae*  
*Epistula Sisebuto*, 100, 110 n58  
*Epître à Ebfred*, 207  
Eriugena, John Scotus, 3, 23-31, 38, 43 n42, 206; *Annotaciones in Marcianum Capellam*, 24, 25, 27, 30; *De Divina Praedestinatione*, 3, 24; *Expositiones in Ierarchiam Coelestem*, 2, 26, 27; *Periphyseon*, 2, 15, 26-27; *Vox Spiritualis*, 28  
Ermoldus Nigellus, 146  
Esposito, Mario, 2, 11, 16  
Ethelred, Ethelstan, Ethelwold. See Aethelred, Aethelstan, etc.  
Eugippius, *Excerpta ex Opera Augustini*, 92  
Eusebius, 13, 52  
Eustochium, St., 119  
Exeter, 162, 166  
Eynsham, 59  
Paris, M.J., 3  
Faustus of Riez, 192 n57  
Fawtier, Robert, 195, 197  
Felix, 68 n24  
Felix, Bp. of Urgel, 144, 145  
Fidolius, 12  
Fintan, Abbot of Tech Munnu, 84,

85, 102  
Flanders, 170  
Fleuriot, Léon, 205, 208  
Fleury, 57, 58, 60, 61, 77 n109, 99  
Florus of Lyons, 106 n22  
Fontaine, Jacques, 96, 100  
Forster, Frobenius, 179, 180  
Fracanus, 197  
France, 170, 179  
Francia, 61  
Frankfort, Council of, 145  
Frithegar, 78 n120  
Frithegod, 77 n110; *Breuilloquium Vitae Wilfredi*, 58  
Froben, Forster, 53  
*Fulda Planisphaera*, 101  
Fulgentius the Mythographer, 36  
Gale, Thomas, 53  
Ganz, David, 53  
Gaul, 6, 83, 86, 88, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 108 n36  
Gebauer, G.J., 72 n59  
Gennadius of Marseilles, 94  
Geraint, King of Devon and Cornwall, 97  
Gerald, 103 n2  
Gerent, 207  
Germain of Auxerre, St., 198, 201  
Gerould, Gordon H., 122  
Gildas, St., 7, 8, 100, 198, 204, 205, 207; *De Excidio*, 205  
Giles, John Allen, 52  
Glanfeuil, 209  
Glastonbury, 63, 100, 167  
Gloucester, 100  
Gneuss, Helmut, 59, 64, 156, 171  
Godescalc of Orbais, 24  
Godman, Peter, 53, 152 n47  
Gottschaller, Eva, 51  
Gregory of Nazianzus, St., 47  
Grosjean, Paul, 3, 14, 108 n31  
Guénaél, St., 196, 199, 208  
Guénolé, St., 196, 197, 199, 201-202, 206, 208  
Guinicastrum, 197  
Gwen Teirbron. See Alba Trimmama  
Gwynn, Aubrey O., 2  
Hadrian of Canterbury, 47, 68 n24, 97  
Haimo of Auxerre, 28  
Hart, C.R., 60, 61  
Hatfield Peverel/Regis, 174 n27

Hauréau, Barthélemy, 180, 181, 183  
Heerwagen, Wilhelm Heinrich, 52  
Heiric of Auxerre, 28  
Helperic, *Liber de Computo*, 60  
Hénoc, 200  
Herren, Michael, 2, 48, 97  
Hertel, Gustav, 11-12  
Hertford, Synod of (AD 672), 97  
Hieronymus Presbyter, *Cosmographia*, 14  
Hilarianus, 88  
Hilarus, archdeacon, 93  
Hillkowitz, Kurt, 14  
Hincmar, Abp. of Reims, 5, 43 n42  
Hincmar of Laon, 30, 43 n42  
Hippo Regius, 89  
Hippocrates, 34  
*Hisperica Famina*, 2, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 205  
*Historia de S. Cuthberto*, 63  
Holtz, Louis, 2  
Horace, 11  
Howlett, David, 64  
Hrabanus, *De Computo*, 99, 100  
Hrabanus Maurus, 146-147; *De Laudibus Sanctae Crucis*, 114, 127 n4  
Hucbald of Saint-Amand, 28  
Hwaetberht of Wearmouth-Jarrow, Abbot, 52  
Hygbald, Bp. of Lindisfarne, 192 n55  
Hygeburg of Heidenheim, 51  
Hyginus, 101  
Hyglae, 49  
Illtyd, St., 198, 201  
Iltut. See Illtyd, St.  
Ima, île d', 199  
Ingelheim, 146  
Iona, 14, 84, 88, 98, 103 n2  
Isidore of Seville, 11, 13, 27, 30, 39, 92, 96, 98, 99, 101, 103 n3, 109 n51a, 110 n58, 139-140, 182; *De Differentiis Rerum*, 36, 38, 39, 98; *De Differentiis Verborum*, 27, 36, 38, 39; *De Natura Rerum*, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 110 n58; *Origines*, 31, 36, 37, 38, 96, 98  
Italy, 6, 86, 89  
*Item Biudem*, 181, 186, 187  
*Item Biudem de Imagine Dei*, 181, 186  
Ithamar of Rochester, 47



- Jackson, Kenneth, 17 n13  
 Jarow, 99  
 Jeauneau, Edouard, 3, 29, 43 n42  
 Jerome, St., 11, 12, 13, 14, 31, 75 n90, 92, 93, 119; *Epistola* 8, 36; *Epistola* 53, 38; In *Esaia Parvula Adbreviatio*, 2; translation of *Chronicle* of Eusebius of Caesarea, 93  
 Jerusalem, 89  
 John, James, 155  
 Jones, Charles W., 46, 52, 89  
 Jost, Karl, 172 n10  
 Julian of Toledo, 47, 68 n24; *Epistola ad Adrianum Abbatem*, 68 n24  
 Junius Psalter, 169  
 Juvenal, 69 n30  
 Juvenius, 53, 119, 124
- Keats, John, "Ode to a Nightingale," 138  
 Kelly, Joseph, 2  
 Kenelm of Winchcombe, St., 61  
 Kenney, James Francis, 16  
 Ker, Neil, 153, 160, 161, 162  
 Kerlouégan, François, 6, 7, 49  
 Keynes, Simon, 163  
 Kitson, Peter, 48  
 Kjølbye-Biddle, B., 59  
 Klopsch, Paul, 114, 124  
 Kösngen, Ewald, 56
- Laisrén, Abbot of Leighlenn, 84, 102  
 Laistner, M.L.W., 45, 50, 53  
 Landévenec, 196, 197, 203, 204, 209  
 Lantfred, 57, 78 n117; *Translatio et Miracula S. Swithuni*, 59  
 Lanthony, 174 n27  
 Laon, 23, 57  
 Lapidge, Michael, 6, 12-13, 157, 168, 206  
 Largillière, René, 195  
 Lathcen, *Eclogae Moralium Gregorii in Iob*, 2  
 Laurentius, Bp. of Canterbury, 91  
 Law, Vivien, 20 n70, 51, 71 n58  
 Lehon, monk of, 196, 198, 201, 202, 204  
 Leidred, Bp. of Lyons, 184  
 Leland, John, 63-64; *Collectanea de Rebus Britannicis*, 64, 82 nn153, 154  
 Leo, Bp. of Rome (AD 444-461), 87  
 Leo, monk, 108 n36  
 Leofnoth, 77 n109  
 Leofric, Bp. of Crediton, 166  
 Leuthere, 49  
 Levison, Wilhelm, 46  
 Lewes, 174 n27  
 Liber Monstromum, 49, 69 n30, 70 n42  
 Libri Carolini, 145, 146, 147, 152, 180, 181, 184, 189 n21, 190 n23; see also Theodulf, Bp. of Orléans  
 Liège, 170  
 Lindisfarne, 54  
 Lindsay, Wallace Martin, 45, 66 nn3, 4  
 Llancarfan. See Nantcarvan  
 Llanddeusant, 199  
 Llanilltud Fawr, 198  
 Lobineau, Dom, 195  
 Löfstedt, Bengt, 2, 3, 4, 15, 72 n59  
 Louis I (the Pious), King, 208-209  
 Louis IV, King, 146  
 Lowe, Elias Avery, 45, 50, 154  
 Löwe, Heinz, 14, 180, 181  
 Lot, Ferdinand, 195  
 Lucan, 101; *Orpheus*, 48, 49, 69 n30  
 Lul, 49  
 Lupus, Servatus, Abbot of Ferrières, 28, 31, 75 n90
- Macedonius, 120  
 McGinty, Dom, 15  
 McNally, Robert E., 2, 8, 9  
 McNamara, Martin, 9, 15  
 MacNeill, Eoin, 6  
 Macrobius, In *Somnium Scipionis*, 62, 80 n139  
 Madec, Goulven, 3  
 Mael-Rúain, 203  
 Mældubh, 96  
 Mag Léna, 85  
 Mag Léna, Synod of (AD 630), 83, 85  
 Magloire, St., 196, 197, 198, 204  
 Mainz, 49  
 Malmesbury, 50, 96, 97, 100  
 Malo, St., 196, 197, 198, 199  
 Malsachanus, *Ars Malsachani*, 3, 4  
 Manitius, 13, 50  
 Manno, 29  
 Marc (Quonomorius), King, 199,

- Marenbon, John, 49, 188 nn1, 2, 189 n21, 193 n67  
 Marianus Scotus, 106 n22  
 Marinus, Bp. of Arles, 86, 87, 105 n15  
 Marius Victorinus, 44 n52  
 Martianus Capella, *De Nuptiis*, 24, 25, 27  
 Martin Hiberniensis, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31-39, 44 n48; *De Epythetis Virgilii*; 36, glossary on the letters of the poet  
 Sedulius, 36  
 Martinet, Suzanne, 44 n48  
 Mathon, Gerard, 24, 26  
 Meehan, Denis, 2  
 Mercia, 50, 55  
 Meyvaert, Paul, 147, 181, 190 n23  
 Milan, 86, 87, 89, 92  
 Milred, Bp. of Worcester, 82 n154  
*Miracula Nyniae*, 46, 54, 75 n87  
 Mocam, Monino, 92  
 Mohrmann, Christine, 7, 8  
 Morin, Germain, 2  
 Morvannou, F., 195  
 Mosinu maccu Min, Abbot of Bangor, 92, 95, 108 n31  
 Most, William George, 3  
 Muirchú, 8, 15  
 Mundó, Anscari, 166  
 Mungret, Co. Limerick, 85  
 Munnu of Taghmon, St., 84, 85  
 Murethach, In *Donati Artem Maiorem*, 2  
 Mynors, R.A.B., 66 n1
- Nantcarvan, 197, 198, 201  
 Naples, 89  
 New Minster, Winchester, 162, 167  
 Nicaea, Council of, 86, 94, 97, 146  
 Ninian, St., 75 n87  
 Norberg, Dag, 4  
 North Africa, 6  
 Northumbria, Northumbrians, 52, 54, 90, 103 n2, 168  
 Nursling (*Nhutscealle*), 51
- Oda, St., Abbot of Cluny, 58  
 Ogilvy, J.D.A., 46, 51, 68 n19, 153  
*Old English Martyrology*, 50  
 Old Minster, Winchester, 58, 59, 62, 162, 168
- Origen, homilies on Numbers, 44 n55  
 Orlandi, G., 3  
 Orléans, Synod of (AD 541), 108 n36  
 Osgar, 57  
 Ossa, île d' (Ushand), 199  
 Oswald, St., Abp. of York, 57, 59, 100  
 Oswald of Worcester, St., 61  
 Oswald the Younger, 61, 64  
 Oswiu, King of Northumbria, 97  
 Ouessant. See Ossa, île d'  
 Ovid, 11, 140  
 Oxford, 174 n27
- Pachomius, St., 92, 93-94  
 Pacificus of Verona, 180  
 Page, Raymond, 64  
 Paphnutius, St., 204  
 Parker Chronicle, 167, 168  
 Parkes, M.B., 72 n59  
 Patrick, St., 3, 12, 17 n13, 86, 87, 88, 199, 201-202, 208; *Opera*, 15  
 Paul, St., 85, 92  
 Paulinus, St., Bp. of Nola, *Vita S. Felicii*, 113, 116  
 Paulinus Aurélien, St., 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 203  
 Paulinus de Carmarthen, St., 197  
 Paulinus of Perigueux, 119  
 Paullus, Lucius Aemilius, 90  
 Paulus de Penychen, 197  
 Penn Ohen, 197  
 Penwith, 199  
 Perphirius, 197  
 Peterborough, 159  
 Petronius of Africa, 90  
 Philippus, commentary on Job, 179  
 Pirus, St., 198  
 Planchart, Alejandro, 59  
 Plato, 32  
 Pliny, 30  
 Plummer, Charles, 45, 66 n1  
 Poland, 160  
 Pompaia, 197  
 Porphyry, *Isagoge*, 33  
 Poulin, Joseph-Claude, 195  
*Prasfatio Cyrilli*, 107 n28  
 Priscian, 137  
*Prologus Cyrilli*, 90, 107 n28  
*Propter quid Homo Factus Sit*, 180, 182, 187  
 Prosper of Aquitaine, St., 53, 62, 119, 120-121  
 Provence, 86



Prudentius Aurelius Clemens, *Peristephanon*, 9, 119, 124  
 Prudentius of Troyes, 24, 62  
 Pseudo-Anatolius, 87-88, 89;  
*Canon Paschalis*, 87, 88  
 Pseudo-Augustine, *De Mirabilibus Sacrae (or Sanctae) Scripturae*, 6  
 Pseudo-Dionysius, 26  
 Pseudo-Dositheus, *Hermeneumata*, 81 n141  
 Pseudo-Isidore, *De Ordine Creaturarum*, 3, 6; *Liber de Numeris*, 9  
 Pyrus, *Ile de*, 198  
 Pythagoras, 34

*Quemadmodum Probari Possit Esse Inlocaliter*, 183, 187  
 Quintilian, 75 n90, 122  
*Quo Argumento Colligendum Sit Deum Esse*, 183, 187  
*Quomodo Quid Sit*, 182  
*Quomodo Sancta et Sempiterna atque Incommutabilis Sit Trinitas*, 183, 187

Ramsey, 58, 59-62, 79 n125  
 Redon, 209  
 Remigius of Auxerre, 25, 27  
 Restitutius of London, 87  
 Rheims, 170  
 Rhygyfarch, 204  
 Riché, Pierre, 195  
 Richter, O.C.Th., 180  
 Rigualus, 197  
 Robert of Hereford, 106 n22  
 Robinson, Armitage, 167  
 Robinson, Fred C., 122  
 Roman Africa, 87, 88, 89, 92;  
 see also North Africa  
 Rome, 87, 89, 91, 92  
 Rosier, James, 48  
 Rühl, Franz, 107 n24  
 Ruinart, Thierry, 53

Sacerdos Presbyter, 87  
 Saint Albans, 164  
 St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 57, 58, 97, 192  
 St. Benoît-sur-Loire, Fleury, 103 n2  
 St. Gall, 146  
 Saint-Germain-des-Prés, 179, 180  
 Saint-Malo, 199  
 St. Peter's, Ghent, 57  
 St. Peter's Minster, Exeter, 166

Sallust, 101  
 Salzburg, 58, 179  
*Salzburg Planisphera*, 101  
 Samson, St., Bp. of Dol, 196-197, 198, 200, 208  
 Schaller, Dieter, 56  
*Scholica Graecorum Glossarium*, 81 n141  
 Scilly, *Iles*, 199  
 Scott, Peter Dale, 136-137, 147  
 Secundinus, St., Bp. in Ireland, *Hymnus* (Hymn on St. Patrick), 15  
 Sedulius, 29, 36, 53, 62, 119, 121, 125; *Carmen Paschale*, 119-120; *Opus Paschale*, 119-120  
 Sedulius Scottus, 28, 43 n39; *Commentum in Maiorem Donatum Grammaticum*, 2; *In Donati Artem Maiorem*, 2; *In Donati Artem Minorem*, 2; *In Eutychem*, 2; *In Priscianum*, 2  
 Ségène, Abbot of Iona (AD 623-652), 85, 96, 102  
 Seneca, 179  
*Sententiae Sancti Agustini et Isidori in Laude Compoti*, 92  
 Sergilius, 9  
 Servius, *praefaces to Virgil*, 32  
 Severus, Sulpicius, 97, 124;  
*Vita S. Martini*, 119  
 Sheldon-Williams, I.P., 2  
 Shrewsbury, 174 n27  
*Si Possit Verum Esse Sine Veritate*, 182, 186  
 Sillan, Abbot of Bangor, 92  
 Silvester, Bp. of Rome, 86  
 Sims-Williams, Patrick, 50  
 Sisebut, King of the Visigoths, 100  
 Sitofolla, 199  
 Smaragdus, Abbot of San Mihiel, 160, 176 n50  
 Smit, Johannes Wilhelmus, 8, 11-12  
 Socrates, 32  
 Southumbria, Southumbrians, 49, 50, 51, 52  
 Southwick, 174 n27  
 Spain, 6, 83, 89  
 Stanford, William Bedell, 14  
 Stephanus of Reims, 30, 43 n43  
 Stevenson, William Henry, 45  
 Strecker, Karl, 46  
 Strunk, Gerhard, 114, 124  
 Stubbs, William, 58, 75 n89  
*Supputatio Romana*, 87, 88

Swithun, St., 59  
 Symeon of Durham, *Historia Regum*, 54, 61, 80 n136  
 Symon Semeonis, *Itinerarium ab Hybernia ad Terram Sanctam*, 2  
 Symons, Thomas, 59

Tabennisi, 93  
 Taeger, Burkhard, 15  
 Taghmon, Co. Wexford, 84  
 Tales, 32  
 Tangl, Michael, 46, 50  
 Tatwine, Abp. of Canterbury, 51, 52; *Ars Grammatica*, 71 n58  
 Tegernsee, 179  
 Temple, Elzbieta, 153, 160  
 Thagaste, 89  
 Theodore, Abp., 47-48, 52, 97  
 Theodulf, Bp. of Orléans, 147;  
*"Epistle to Modoin"*, 147;  
*Libri Carolini*, 73 n76, 147, 181  
 Theophilus, 89  
 Theophilus, Bp. of Alexandria (AD 385-412), 89, 107 n28  
 Theophilus, Bp. of Caesarea, 89;  
*Epistola Theophili*, 88  
 Thiel, Matthias, 11  
 Thomas of Cantimpré, *Liber de Natura Rerum*, 70 n42  
 Thomson, Rodney, 50  
 Tierney, J.J., 2  
 Tírechán, 15  
*"Tollemache Orosius"*, 168, 177 n70  
 Tours, 137, 144  
 Traube, Ludwig, 12  
 Tréguier, monk of, 196  
 Tudual, St., 196, 197  
 Turiau, 207

Uhlfelder, Myra, 137-138  
 Umbraphel, 197  
 Utrecht Psalter, 159  
*Utrum Secundum Tempus an Secundum Excellentiam Deus est Ante Tempora*, 182, 187  
 Uuenti (Gwent), 197  
 Uuento, 197

Venantius Fortunatus, 53, 119  
 Vergil. See Virgil  
 Vezin, Jean, 77 n109  
 Victor, Bp. of Rome (AD 189-198), 89  
 Victorius, 109 n41; see also Victorius of Aquitaine  
 Victorius of Aquitaine, 88, 92-

93, 95, 97, 107 n28, 109 n48;  
*Calculus*, 92, 109 n51a; *Cur-sus Paschalis*, 93; *Laterculus Victorii*, 108 n36  
*Vie de Guénall*, 197, 203  
*Vie de Guénolé*, 196, 201, 204, 206, 207

*Vie de Magloire*, 196, 205, 209  
*Vie de Malo*, 197  
*Vie de Paul*, 196, 206, 207, 208  
*Vie de Turiau*, 203, 207  
 Vinnianus, *Penitentiale*, 15  
 Virgil, 11, 32, 39, 51, 124, 159

Virgil the Grammarian. See Virgilius Maro Grammaticus  
 Virgilius, St., Bp. of Salzburg, 9, 14

Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 38;  
*Epitomae*, 13  
*Vita David*, 204

*Vita Iohannis Abbatis Reomaensis*, 108 n36

*Vita Metrica Sanctae Brigidae*, 15

*Vita prima Samsonis*, 196, 205  
*Vita of St. Ecgwine of Evesham*, 63

*Vita S. Birini*, 63

*Vita S. Bonifatii Archiepiscopi Moguntini*, 46

*Vita S. Ceolfredi*, 66 n1

*Vita S. Indractis*, 63

*Vita S. Murnu Siue Pintani*, 84

*Vita S. Neoti*, 63

*Vita S. Rumboldi*, 63

*Vita S. Senani*, 15

*Vita secunda Samsonis*, 196, 205

Vitalinus, Bp. of Rome (AD 657-672), 97, 109 n48

Walker, G.S.M., 2

Wallach, Luitpold, 135, 145; 41 n10, 15

Waltham, 174 n27

Wealdhere, Bp. of London, 50

Wearmouth, 99

Wessex, 7, 48, 54, 63, 98

Whitby, Council of (AD 664), 97, 98, 103 n2

Whitelock, Dorothy, 172 n10

Whithorn, Co. Galloway, 75 n87

Wicbald, Bp. of Auxerre (AD 879-887), 28

Wilfrid, 97

William of Malmesbury, 79 n125, 96

Winchester, 59, 63, 78 n120,



80 n138, 176 n61; see also  
 Old Minster, Winchester; New  
 Minster, Winchester  
 Windsor, 174 n27  
 Winibertus, Abbot, 24  
 Winniau, 198  
 Winterbottom, Michael, 7-8, 48,  
 65, 206  
 Worcester, 160, 162, 176 n50  
 Worcester Passional, 160  
 Wordsworth, William, 137  
 Wormald, Francis, 165  
 Wrdisten, Abbot, 196, 203, 205,  
 208  
 Wright, Neil, 52

Wrmnoc, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200,  
 202, 205, 206, 207  
 Wulfad, Abbot of Saint-Merard,  
 Soissons, 28  
 Wulfstan, Abp., 157, 172 n10  
 Wulfstan the Cantor, *Narratio*  
*Metrica de S. Swithuno*, 59;  
*Vita S. Aethelwaldi*, 59  
 Würzburg, 179  
 York, 53, 54, 60, 61, 75 nn87,  
 90, 137, 159  
 "York Annals," 54, 75 n89  
 Zimmerman, F., 180

OLIN LIBRARY - CIRCULATION  
 DATE DUE

<del>SEP 28 1982</del>	<del>SEP 28 1982</del>
<del>OCT 8 1982</del>	<del>JAN 2 1992</del>
PRS	<del>AUG 8 1984</del>
<del>APR 9 1984</del>	<del>DEC 7 1985</del>
<del>FEB 10 1985</del>	<del>FEB 8 1985</del>
<del>PR AUG 6 '85</del>	
<del>PR 11 29</del>	SEP 8 0 2009
PRS	
<del>JUL 26 1989</del>	
<del>JUL 06 1989</del>	
GAYLORD	PRINTED IN U.S.A.